

## **Comhairle Chontae na Mí**

Teach Buvinda, Bóthar Átha Cliath, An Uaimh,  
Contae na Mí, C15 Y291

Fón: 046 – 9097000/Fax: 046 – 9097001

R-phost: [customerservice@meathcoco.ie](mailto:customerservice@meathcoco.ie)

Web: [www.meath.ie](http://www.meath.ie) - Registration No. 00172770



## **Meath County Council**

Buvinda House, Dublin Road, Navan,  
Co. Meath, C15 Y291

Tel: 046 – 9097000/Fax: 046 – 9097001

E-mail: [customerservice@meathcoco.ie](mailto:customerservice@meathcoco.ie)

Web: [www.meath.ie](http://www.meath.ie) - Registration No. 00172770

Case Reference: ABP-318629-23

**An Bord Pleanála**  
**64 Marlborough Street**  
**Dublin 1**  
**D01 V902**

Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2024

**Re: Meath County Council Compulsary Purchase (No. 1 ) Order 2023.N2 Slane By-Pass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme Slane, Co. Meath**

Dear Sir/ Madam,

In response to your letter dated the 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2024 please find enclosed the responses to the CPO submissions 1 to 17.

Two hard copies will follow in the post.

Meath County Council are sending each individual who made a submission correspondence with the reply to their submission which is as per the enclosed.

Please note that all responses will be displayed on the [n2slanebypass.ie](http://n2slanebypass.ie) website.

Yours Faithfully,

Enda Weldon  
Senior Executive Engineer

## ABP CASE NUMBER:

A B P - 3 1 8629 - 2 3

Meath County Council (MCC)  
Response to **CPO** Submissions  
received from the Board on the  
4th March 2024



comhairle chontae na mí  
*meath county council*

## **Index of CPO Submissions**

1. Carla Meade, Marie Therese Meade Emma Meade & John Meade
2. Davina Gray
3. Elaine Collins
4. Fenner Farm Limited
5. Francis Ledwidge Museum
6. Jack Rogers
7. John and Mary Colgan
8. John Kealy
9. Joseph Coen
10. Legal Representatives for the Nangle Family
11. Mark Laird
12. Michael & Elaine Cully
13. Michelle & Kevin Garrigan
14. Monica and William Connolly
15. Patricia Farrell
16. Paul Loughran
17. Susan Traill

**N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme**

ABP Case Number: ABP-318629-23

**Meath County Council (MCC) Response to CPO Submissions received from the Board on the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2024**

<b>No.:</b>	01	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Carla Meade, Marie Therese Meade, Emma Meade, and John Meade (CPO 123)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b></p> <p>The landowners object to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of the proposed N51 East realignment and landowner access tracks.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway. More details are required.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0008 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>It is noted that aspects of drainage are also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution at this residential property.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>

<b>No.:</b>	01	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Carla Meade, Marie Therese Meade, Emma Meade, and John Meade (CPO 123)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		This dwelling is referenced as R948 in Appendix 9.4 Operational Noise Predictions and 9.5 Operational Noise Predictions with Mitigation Measures. The predicted noise levels at the most exposed façade will decrease as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Noise for the design year (2041) will decrease from 60 dB Lden without the scheme in place to 58 dB Lden with the scheme in place. Hence, no mitigation measures are proposed.
4	<p><b>Access - General</b> The landowners have insufficient information re. access.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Access to lands during construction of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states that “Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and divided lands will, where practicable, be maintained by the contractor during construction of the Proposed Scheme; otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided to and from divided land plots and to and from the public road network.”</p> <p>Access to lands following completion of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states, “Permanent access will be provided to all divided lands. Where required this access will be to and from the public road network and where appropriate the access will be by way of farm tracks and overbridges”.</p>
5	<p><b>Screening and Planting</b> We object to the inadequate screening and planting being proposed. High amenity trees that are over thirty years planted are being removed in the CPO and there is currently no proposal to replace these.</p>	<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been provided in EIAR Chapter 12 (Landscape and Visual). As part of the LVIA an assessment of the potential impacts arising from the Proposed Scheme during both Construction Phase and Operational Phase on residential receptors within 300m of the Proposed Scheme has been included at Section 12.4.4. The findings from this assessment have identified that minor to moderate impacts are predicted for this receptor during the operational phase of the project.</p> <p>The sitewide mitigation set out in Table 12-38 (Specific Landscape Measures) states that “new woodland planting will be provided to compensate for losses of woodland, hedgerows, and trees adjacent to the Proposed Scheme during construction operations and to accommodate the improvements. Different woodland types will be established to reflect the existing woodland composition and promote integration with the existing character”.</p> <p>Design of replacement planting associated with the N51 realignment at this location will be further developed during the detailed design stage.</p>
6	<p><b>Boundary Treatment</b> Inadequate detail has been provided regarding the type of boundary to be provided along the new CPO line.</p>	<p>Boundary treatment proposals for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.2 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>Boundary treatment proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-FE0005 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Timber post and tension mesh fencing, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00321, is proposed along the road boundary at this location.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	01	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Carla Meade, Marie Therese Meade, Emma Meade, and John Meade (CPO 123)	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>Timber post and rail fencing, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00301, is proposed along either side of the Access Track 1A.</p> <p>Replacement walls and gate are proposed at the property entrance. These will be similar to the existing entrance walls and gate.</p>
7	<p><b>Lighting</b> Insufficient detail has been provided in the EIAR regarding the artificial lighting proposals along the new road.</p>	<p>Road lighting proposals for the scheme are described in Section 4.4.14.4 of EIAR Chapter 4. It is noted that road lighting is not proposed along the road adjacent to this property.</p>
8	<p><b>Services</b> We have not been provided with adequate information to deal with the impact on services.</p>	<p>A summary of existing utilities impacted by the scheme and description of the proposed utility works are provided in Section 4.4.12 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>The utility design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-UT0005 in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for impacts on existing utilities are described in Section 22.5 of EIAR Chapter 22 (Material Assets: Utilities).</p> <p>Impact on services is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20.</p>
9	<p><b>Environmental Impacts</b> The proposed road development will have significant adverse effects on the environment on human beings, livestock, fauna and flora, soil water, air, climate, the landscape and general environment and biodiversity. There are hares at and near the property and these are a legally protected species since 1930.</p>	<p>The Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) submitted as part of the application for development consent for the proposed N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme') assesses the potential effects of the development on the environment. The EIAR chapters provide a robust impact assessment on the environmental factors in accordance with the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended (the 'EIA Directive'). Where significant effects have been identified within these EIAR Chapters, appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures have been developed to reduce the potential negative effects of the Proposed Scheme on the environment. The EIAR has been prepared in accordance with best practice guidelines on EIA, including Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) guidelines, as well as topic-specific guidelines including the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA).</p> <p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures were implemented in full the Proposed Project, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites.</p> <p>In addition, an Environmental Operating Plan (EOP) prepared in accordance with the TII Guidelines for the Creation, Implementation and Maintenance of an Environmental Operating Plan as part of the overall mitigation strategy, has been included in the EIAR (Vol. 4, Appendix 5.6). The EOP includes, in an appendix to it, the mitigation and monitoring measures relevant to the contractor from EIAR Chapter 27 – Schedule of Environmental Commitments. The contractor will take ownership of the</p>

<b>No.:</b>	01	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Carla Meade, Marie Therese Meade, Emma Meade, and John Meade (CPO 123)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		EOP once appointed. EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 5, Section 5.10 Environmental Management During Construction, states that “MCC will ensure that all mitigation and monitoring committed to in the EIAR and NIS and planning conditions, will be enforced on the contractor through express terms of the contract, and will be overseen by an official engaged by the Council.”
10	<b>Legal, Design and Planning Matters</b> Such other legal, design and planning matters as may arise when more detailed design information is made available.	Noted.
11	<b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.	Noted.
12	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	Noted. An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.

<b>No.:</b>	02	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Davina Gray	
Item No.	Observation	Response
1	<p>The scheme involves compulsory acquisition under Section 49 of the Road Act 1993. Meath County Council believes that it is entitled not just to acquire lands, but to extinguish public rights of way and create public rights of way, and contends that the public cannot participate in that process under s19, which contention is wrong in law and in fact.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The application is not being made under Section 49 of the Roads Act 1993.</p> <p>The scheme herein and associated Compulsory Purchase Order is being advanced and made pursuant to Section 76 and the Third Schedule of the Housing Act, 1966 as amended by Section 10 of the Local Government Act, 1960, as substituted by Section 86 of the Housing Act, 1966 and as amended by Section 6 of the Roads Act of 1993 and the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended. It is not an acquisition under Section 49 of the Roads Act, 1993. The CPO will fall to be considered by the Board as part of its consideration of the underlying proposed road development and including the construction and/or alignment of new public roads and extinguishment of rights of way. An EIA an AA have been prepared and published and the public's full rights of public participation at an early and effective stage of the approval process are being fully protected and vindicated.</p> <p>The public are not being excluded from the process relating to extinguishment of public rights. Further the public rights along the Boyne are being preserved.</p> <p>We would note that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) submitted as part of the application for development consent for the Proposed Scheme assesses the potential effects of the development on the environment. The EIAR chapters provide a robust impact assessment on the environmental factors in accordance with the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended (the 'EIA Directive'). Where significant effects have been identified within these EIAR Chapters, including in relation to the landtake required for the Proposed Scheme and the materials arising to facilitate construction of the Proposed Scheme, appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures have been developed to reduce the potential negative effects of the Proposed Scheme on the environment.</p> <p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures are implemented in full the Proposed Scheme, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites. The NIS, in conjunction with detailed information in the EIAR, specifically deals with effects on all hydrologically connected Special Areas of Conservation.</p> <p>It is noted that the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage state the following in their submission in the context of nature conservation with respect to the Proposed Scheme: "Having considered the documentation supporting this road scheme application, and in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS), the Department is satisfied in general that the approaches set out in these documents with regards to both the design of the project and the adoption of measures to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on plants, animals and habitats during its construction and operation should result in the minimisation of such impacts to the extent that no significant negative effects should result to flora or fauna including Qualifying Interests (QIs) for local European sites from the scheme's implementation as proposed. It is considered that if the</p>



<b>No.:</b>	02	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Davina Gray	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		measures set out in the EIAR and NIS to avoid and reduce possible adverse impacts on flora, fauna and habitats are diligently implemented in accordance with the methodologies proposed, any significant potential adverse effects on plants and animals can be avoided, including any effects on species which are QIs for the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Protection Area (SPA) which the road scheme is to traverse or for the downstream Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC and Boyne Estuary SPA."

<b>No.:</b>	03	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Elaine Collins (CPO 120)	
Item No.	Observation	Response
1	<p>The proposed route of the road will have a seriously injurious affection to the roadside cottage dwelling. Please see enclosed photos showing the position of the cottage's front porch in relation to the existing road. In the proposed road widening scheme, the front porch will be much closer to the widened road which is wholly unacceptable and materially affects the market value of the property.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the scheme's landtake on non-agricultural properties is described in Section 21.4.2 of EIAR Chapter 21 (Material Assets: Non-agricultural Properties). The results of this assessment recognise that the pre-mitigation impact of the scheme's landtake on this property (CPO 120b and 120d) is significant and the residual impact remains significant with mitigation measures implemented, i.e. boundary treatment will be reinstated to preconstruction condition and access to the property will be retained. The landowners will be entitled to claim for compensation arising out of the CPO and any associated injurious affection arising out of the use of the land acquired from this landowner by the Council which will be subject of a separate process.</p>
2	<p>There will be a complete lack of privacy and the peaceable and reasonable enjoyment of this property will be greatly reduced. In addition, there will be increased noise pollution from the greater volume of passing traffic immediately outside the cottage.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p> <p>This dwelling is reference R938 in Appendix 9.4 Operational Noise Predictions and 9.5 Operational Noise Predictions with Mitigation Measures. The predicted noise levels at the most exposed façade will remain <u>unchanged</u> as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Noise for the design year (2041) will remain at 72 dB. Hence, no mitigation measures are proposed as the noise impact will be no worse than the situation without the Proposed Scheme in place.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	04	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Fennor Farm (CPO 107)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment</p> <p>Lands are to be permanently acquired from this landowner to allow construction of the proposed N2 Mainline and an attenuation pond. Lands are also to be temporarily acquired, for duration of the project's construction, to provide space for stockpiling of excavated material.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway regarding the realignment of existing drains that may be severed by the proposed new road and there are concerns about adverse drainage problems to the retained lands during and after the construction of the new road.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0001 and MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Where adjacent lands drain towards the road scheme, interceptor drainage is proposed alongside the earthworks to collect runoff and convey to a suitable outfall.</p> <p>It is noted that the matter of drainage is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>

<b>No.:</b>	04	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Fennor Farm (CPO 107)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
4	<p><b>Access and Over Bridge</b></p> <p>There is additional information needed in relation to the exact design of the over bridge and this is a matter of significant concern to the property owner.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4. Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0001 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Overbridge 1 is proposed to provide access between severed lands. The designs of the proposed overbridges are described in Section 4.4.10.2 of EIAR Chapter 4. The design of Overbridge 1 is illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-ST03-N2-DR-D-BR0103-01 and MDT0806-RPS-ST03-N2-DR-D-BR0103-02 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. As per Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4, access tracks will be constructed as per TII CC-SCD-00706 and will generally have a pavement width of approximately 4.0 m with approximately 1.0 m wide grassed verges.</p>
5	<p><b>Other Matters</b></p> <p>Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted
6	<p>The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	05	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Francis Ledwidge Museum (CPO 128/129)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p>The Francis Ledwidge Museum promotes the life and works of one of County Meath's great literary figures. As well as welcoming visitors, the museum provides educational tours to primary level schools and to historical societies and active age groups. Each year, the museum organises activities and events to commemorate Francis Ledwidge, adding value to and promoting the tourism potential of the Boyne Valley and contributing to the cultural life of County Meath.</p> <p>The property, built in 1886 consists of two Parnell Cottages. Both cottages are intact with piggeries and hen lofts, as was typical of the period when they were built following a nineteenth century Local Government (Ireland) Act, which was an enlightened scheme to provide ownership and security of tenure in rural locations to those who worked on the land.</p> <p>Today, the one-acre garden that accompanies the first cottage where Ledwidge was born, has been creatively landscaped to create a looped walk that passes a monument dedicated to the poet, a facsimile of a memorial that stands on the outskirts of Boezinge in Belgium near where Ledwidge was killed. The peaceful tranquillity of the garden is an essential part of the visitor experience, where visitors take time out to relax, reflect, and enjoy the calm and peaceful surroundings that so informed and inspired much of the poet's writings.</p> <p>The Museum Committee facilitates outdoor events in the garden e.g. poetry readings and small concerts, taking part in national cultural celebrations such as Poetry Day Ireland and Heritage Week. The museum host regular group visits e.g. School Tours, Active Retirement and History Groups etc.</p> <p>The Francis Ledwidge Museum is managed and administered by a voluntary committee, a small but dedicated group of Ledwidge enthusiasts who take pride in the writings of the poet and the restoration and upkeep of his birthplace. The museum cottage has protected building status RPS: MH019-112.</p> <p>Mission Statement of Francis Ledwidge Museum Committee: To promote an appreciation of the writings and poetry of Francis Ledwidge to as wide an audience as possible and to protect the name, birthplace and memory of Ledwidge for future generations.</p> <p>Reference: Creative Ireland Culture and Creative Strategy for Meath 2023-2027 Strategic Priorities for Meath County Council</p> <p>5.1 To conserve and promote our cultural and literary inheritance To protect and enhance our literary legacy to ensure that great writers like Mary Lavin, Francis Ledwidge and Lord Dunsany are forever identified with County Meath. To prioritise conservation and promotion of our literary inheritance.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme is a multi-modal transport solution, designed to provide transport infrastructure to improve a wide range of transport and other social needs within the study area in line with national, regional and local priorities. The headline aim of the scheme is to improve road safety along the N2 through Slane village, where the existing sub-standard alignment and the volumes and nature (large proportion of Heavy Good Vehicles (HGV)) of traffic passing through the village has resulted in a history of traffic accidents. In so doing, a number of other aims can be achieved which bring health, environmental and network benefits to the area. Other key aims of the scheme are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To remove the existing 'bottle-neck' at Slane from the national road network and thereby improve the overall efficiency of the network for enhanced regional and rural connectivity.</li> <li>• To provide a safer road network in Slane and on the wider strategic road network.</li> <li>• To provide active travel connectivity locally and regionally which will provide enhanced access to existing and future facilities in the area for the benefit of both local residents and visitors alike.</li> <li>• To improve environmental quality in Slane village, particularly with regard to air quality emissions, traffic noise and vibration emissions and levels of traffic.</li> <li>• To provide for new electric vehicle charging points, thus improving facilities to encourage the change from petrol/diesel powered vehicles to electric.</li> <li>• To improve the movement of freight and other HGV traffic, removing the need for large vehicles to negotiate the high gradients and limited capacity on the N2 within the village area improving journey times and efficiency, and reduce the cost of travel across the wider transportation network at a cost that offers good value for money.</li> <li>• To enhance the village centre as a viable, vibrant and attractive location for people to live, work and visit by improving the Public Realm in the village centre.</li> </ul> <p>EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 8 – Population, Section 8.3 (Description of Existing Environment (Baseline Scenario)), Section 8.3.1.1 (Character and Significance) recognises the Francis Ledwidge Museum and its location in Slane, while Section 8.3.1.2 (Sensitivity) recognises it as a key tourist attraction for the area.</p> <p>EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 14 – Architectural Heritage, Section 14.1 (Description of Existing Environment (Baseline Scenario)), Section 14.4.1.1 (Historical context) also acknowledges the historical significance of the museum, and its protected status.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	05	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Francis Ledwidge Museum (CPO 128/129)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>To work in collaboration with independent and community providers like The Francis Ledwidge Museum.</p> <p>The above serves to illustrate the literary and historical importance of the museum and the contribution that the museum makes to culture and tourism of the area. It also serves as background that inform the following Issues of concern that we believe have clear potential to impact on the workings of the museum.</p> <p>It is proposed that a new roundabout is to be situated 90 metres from the Museum eastern boundary on the N51 east of Slane as part of the Bypass construction works. This is the minimum. distance as required under road design regulations. Ref: Transport Infrastructure Ireland GEO-03060 Geometric Design of Junctions (Priority Junctions, Roundabouts, Grade Separated Junctions) chp 5 Fig 5.2. We wish to express our disappointment that despite expression of our concerns at separate meetings with RPS Design Consultants and Meath County Council, that the minimum distance is being maintained in the current plans.</p> <p>It is our belief that this does not show a clear understanding or appreciation of the cultural and conservation status of the museum. We acknowledge that this is in compliance with statutory requirements regarding minimum distance to roundabouts. Our disappointment is that the scope for a longer distance from the museum to the roundabout is not achieved in the plans.</p>	
2	<p>It is proposed that a new roundabout is to be situated 90 metres from the Museum eastern boundary on the N51 east of Slane as part of the Bypass construction works. This is the minimum. distance as required under road design regulations. Ref: Transport Infrastructure Ireland GEO-03060 Geometric Design of Junctions (Priority Junctions, Roundabouts, Grade Separated Junctions) chp 5 Fig 5.2. We wish to express our disappointment that despite expression of our concerns at separate meetings with RPS Design Consultants and Meath County Council, that the minimum distance is being maintained in the current plans.</p> <p>It is our belief that this does not show a clear understanding or appreciation of the cultural and conservation status of the museum. We acknowledge that this is in compliance with statutory requirements regarding minimum distance to roundabouts. Our disappointment is that the scope for a longer distance from the museum to the roundabout is not achieved in the plans.</p>	<p>The possibility of increasing the distance of the roundabout in an easterly direction was considered by the design team. However, the following constraints apply which precluded this possibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The River Boyne Bridge crossing location is an optimised location in terms of ecological and World Heritage Property considerations. This constrains the horizontal alignment of the Proposed Scheme as it continues in a northerly direction.</li> <li>• The horizontal alignment is maintained as a straight on the proposed River Boyne bridge to minimise construction complexity.</li> <li>• The horizontal alignment veers North-east on a horizontal curvature to the limit of acceptable standards, where a Departure from standards was required so that it aligns as far east as possible on approaching the existing N51. This is the key constraint on the location of the proposed N51 roundabout. In effect, the roundabout is sited as much to the east as feasible with an alignment compliant with the relevant standards.</li> </ul> <p>Other considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating the roundabout substantially off-line to facilitate ease of construction and traffic safety.</li> <li>• The off-line roundabout location facilitates straight links to the roundabout on the realigned N51 on both approaches.</li> <li>• Facilitating the alignment of the section from the N51 to the northern tie-in to align close to an existing land boundary to minimise land severance.</li> </ul>

<b>No.:</b>	05	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Francis Ledwidge Museum (CPO 128/129)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Taking account of the above, the proposed roundabout location is optimised and has been situated as far as is feasible from Ledwidge Museum .
3	<p>In expressing our disappointment, we accept the compliance here and now wish to draw attention to two design issues of particular concern. On drawing No. DM1002 the existing road will be realigned, and C.P.O. Ref. plot marked 128a.1 shows the front of the Museum. On the CPO-Schedule. PDF, Page 46 Ref. E09-E10 there is a reference to the construction of a sound barrier on plot 146g.1 beside the eastern boundary of the Museum (with plot 146a.2 being used for temporary inspection and maintenance). Our concern is the design of this sound barrier. We would require a solid wall barrier to mitigate the increased noise level anticipated from all the extra traffic on the new roundabout. It is an established fact that masonry walls are more effective at blocking road sounds than even the best wooden fences which would have gaps and a much lighter mass.</p> <p>The RPS Group, in part of their E.I.A.R Report state that noise mitigation is required Ref. R1066a Ledwidge Cottage Museum in their prepared Noise level Report. This is in Vol 4, Appendix 9, Page 107 (see attached). For all the above reasons, we believe a masonry wall is essential.</p>	<p>A 2m high noise barrier is proposed along the eastern property boundary of the Ledwidge Museum as shown on EIAR Vol. 3 Scheme Drawings, Drawing No. MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-FE0004.</p> <p>A key design requirement for a noise barrier is that it be 'solid' and without gaps through which noise vibrations may pass. Timber noise barriers are the typical bespoke proprietary products designed to achieve this objective.</p> <p>TII's Specification for Road Works - Fencing and Environmental Noise Barriers CC-SPW-00300 sets out the requirements for noise barriers. Section 10 of the TII document states..."Environmental Noise Barriers shall achieve the performance criteria set out in the Contract Documents in accordance with I.S. EN 1793-1, I.S. EN 1793-2, I.S. EN 1793-3, I.S. EN 1794-1 and I.S. EN 1794- 2 following the specifications outlined in I.S. EN 14388, this Section, and any additional requirements described in Appendix 3/1. Environmental Noise Barriers are to be manufactured in a factory, where the barrier was developed and the factory shall be accredited to ISO 9001 for the manufacture of the specific noise barrier panel or components. No on-site assemblies of Environmental Noise Barrier panels are permitted."</p> <p>The standard goes on to say that "The Contractor shall submit documented evidence demonstrating how the barriers meet the specified standards and the documentation shall clearly indicate the absorptive performance where such barrier type is used and airborne sound insulation categories of the constructed barriers as outlined in I.S. EN 1793 –1 and I.S. EN 1793 –2" Noise barriers must have a minimum insulation performance of B3 in accordance with I.S. EN 1793: Part 2.</p> <p>The solution provided will meet the requirements in TII's Specification for Road Works - Fencing and Environmental Noise Barriers CC-SPW-00300.</p> <p>In respect of the sound insulation performance of a timber noise barrier vs a masonry wall, it is correct to say the sound insulation performance of a masonry wall will be greater than that of a timber noise barrier due to the density and thickness of the material. However, this relates to the intrinsic performance of the noise barrier, the noise barrier dimensions (e.g. length and height) as well as proximity to the source and receiver locations will impact on the overall performance of the noise barrier and the noise level received at the receiver location. Provided the noise barrier meets the requirements in IS EN 1793-2, there would a negligible difference in the received noise level. EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 9 – Noise and Vibration in the mitigation set out in Section 9.5.2 states that noise barriers may take the form of walls, earthen berms and other landscaping features provided they fulfil the acoustics screening requirements as well as meeting all other technical specifications.</p>
4	<p>The second concern is the indicated Pedestrian Crossing to the Museum from the proposed new footpath on the southern side of the N51 coming out from Slane Village to the new roundabout.</p> <p>The Drawing Ref. GA2201 on Environmental Impact Assessment Report- Volume 3- Scheme Drawings- No 2 General Arrangements - Drawing 6.</p>	<p>The proposed design is that the pedestrian crossing is an uncontrolled crossing. The Scheme envisages that pedestrians wishing to cross the road will await a suitable gap in traffic. This design is based on prediction of low pedestrian demand and considerations that the predicted traffic and conditions on the N51 West will be such that there will be suitable gaps to facilitate the occasional pedestrian demand.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	05	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Francis Ledwidge Museum (CPO 128/129)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>We very much welcome the addition of this pedestrian crossing in the plan. However, there is no detail of the type of Pedestrian Crossing envisaged in the Plan. This poses the question as to how for example purposes, a group of school children or any other group would cross a very busy road in safety bearing in mind the increased volume of vehicular traffic coming off the roundabout. Given the stagger distance from the proposed pedestrian crossing to the roundabout is 90m then we believe that in the interest of Health and Safety, this MUST be a light-controlled crossing. Ref: TII DN-GEO-03044 1.9b "To provide a safe and convenient environment for pedestrians and cyclists."</p> <p>This would allow any pedestrians and/or cyclists to press the signal button and allow safe crossing of the pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>The design of the N51 in this location is described in EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Description of the Proposed Scheme, Section 4.4.5 (N51 West). This road is treated as a combination of rural fringe and transition zone on the approach to the urban village of Slane. The design includes particular measures to control traffic speeds and to maintain a 60kph speed limit. As described in Section 4.4.5 of EIAR Chapter 4, these particular measures include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibition of overtaking within the rural fringe, using more formal landscaping, signs, continuous centre line road markings leading to the Gateway treatment</li> <li>• Extension of urban 60 km/h speed limit from the village to the bypass</li> <li>• Elimination of the hard strip;</li> <li>• Narrowing of the carriageway;</li> <li>• Use of signs including Driver Speed Feedback signs and landscaping with a vertical emphasis;</li> <li>• Retention of existing tourist signage;</li> <li>• Use of appropriate soft landscape elements such as small girth trees or shrubs which change in composition and degree of formality along the rural fringe to the Gateway/Transition Zone;</li> <li>• Provide roadside mown verges, particularly as the Gateway is approached;</li> <li>• Provision of pedestrian facilities; and</li> <li>• Provision of road lighting,</li> </ul> <p>The measures proposed will create an environment distinctly different from the current 'open road' conditions that currently apply to this section of the N51.</p>
5	<p>In addition, appropriate signage to be installed on approach to inform motorists of vehicles of upcoming pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Description of the Proposed Scheme, Section 4.4.5.2 (Design Standards) states the following in respect of signage for the N51 west: <i>Roadside treatments such as provision of the footway, public lighting, road markings, signage, landscape treatments and existing roadside development, as well as the mandatory speed limit reinforce the message to drivers to slow down within this zone.</i></p> <p>Section 4.4.14 (Other Scheme Design Aspects), Section 4.4.14.1 (Signage), states that: <i>Traffic signs, road markings and road studs will be provided in accordance with the Traffic Signs Manual (TSM), August 2019 (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport) and any subsequent amendment of this document.</i></p> <p>In addition, EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 9 – Population, Section 8.5.1.6 (Economic Impacts) states the following construction phase mitigation in respect of provision of signage: <i>Dedicated signage shall be provided for existing tourist attractions affected by construction traffic management within and on approach to the village. In addition, signage providing advance direction to local services shall be provided in advance of construction.</i></p> <p>Section 8.5.2.5 (Economic Impacts) states the following operational phase mitigation in respect of provision of signage: <i>Dedicated signage will be provided in accordance with the Department of Transport</i></p>



<b>No.:</b>	05	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Francis Ledwidge Museum (CPO 128/129)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<i>Traffic Signs Manual (DoT, 2019). In accordance with the NRA Policy on the Provision of Tourist and Leisure Signage on National Roads (2011), this will be generic in nature except where tourist facilities are of high significance or achieve a threshold of visitor numbers.</i>
6	We would request that our concerns regarding the above are considered in any technical review and examination of the plans. If the above-mentioned concerns are addressed as requested, the Francis Ledwidge Museum Committee would be satisfied in totality to support the proposed Slane N2 Bypass plan.	Refer to responses to Items 1-5.

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	As we understand the application, the council are seeking approval of the scheme under section 51 of the 1993 Roads Act and an order confirming the compulsory acquisition of land under S. 49 of the said.	Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme'). The application is not being made under Section 49 of the Roads Act 1993.
2	It would appear that in order to ground an application under s.49 it is necessary to have regard to Council Directive 2011 /92 and have prepared an Environmental Impact Assessment report in respect of that application. This would have to deal with all likely significant effects arising from the compulsory acquisition of the lands, the extinguishment of all public rights, the creation of new public rights, the temporary acquisition of land, the creation of way levies, as well as the other Interests in land that are either created or extinguished arising from the said scheme.	The CPO and the extinction of public rights have been the subject of an environmental assessment. The scheme herein and associated Compulsory Purchase Order is being advanced and made pursuant to Section 76 and the Third Schedule of the Housing Act, 1966 as amended by Section 10 of the Local Government Act, 1960, as substituted by Section 86 of the Housing Act, 1966 and as amended by Section 6 of the Roads Act of 1993 and the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended. It is not an acquisition under Section 49 of the Roads Act, 1993. The CPO will fall to be considered by the Board as part of its consideration of the underlying proposed road development and including the construction and/or alignment of new public roads and extinguishment of rights of way. An EIA an AA have been prepared and published and the public's full rights of public participation at an early and effective stage of the approval process are being fully protected and vindicated.
3	As a member of the public, who is part of a community where there is to be impacts including significant impacts on human beings arising from the acquisition, impacts on material assets, impacts on landscape, as well as impacts on biodiversity and ecology. I wish to engage in the environmental impact assessment that is required to be carried out by the board in respect of these matters, but cannot do so because the necessary documentation, and particularly the environmental impact assessment report, does not address the application made under section 49. Consequently, therefore, if the board were to accept the application made to confirm the CPO, they would be acting contrary to European Community law and would have no jurisdiction to determine the application made under section 49.	The Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) submitted as part of the application for development consent for the Proposed Scheme assesses the potential effects of the development on the environment. The EIAR chapters provide a robust impact assessment on the environmental factors in accordance with the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended (the 'EIA Directive'). Where significant effects have been identified within these EIAR Chapters, appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures have been developed to reduce the potential negative effects of the Proposed Scheme on the environment. The EIAR has been prepared in accordance with best practice guidelines on EIA, including Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) guidelines as well as topic-specific guidelines as documented in each EIAR chapter.
4	The application for compulsory purchase order is one to which engages the Habitats Directive in order for the application to be considered in that regard the application must be accompanied by a natura impact statement which specifically addresses the issues relevant to the directive as well as the in-combination effects. As a member of the public, I am entitled to participate in that process particularly where the application will have the most profound effects on the river Boyne and Blackwater SAC/SPA, as well as the Boyne Estuary SAC/SPA, but given the absence of the request information it is impossible to participate in that process.	A comprehensive Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIAR and this is detailed in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 16 – Biodiversity: Aquatic Ecology. These assessments identified design measures which have been integrated to avoid/reduce impacts in the first instance, and includes mitigation and monitoring measures to address significant effects which are set out in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 27 – Schedule of Environmental Commitments.
5	As a preliminary matter, the board should confirm that the application in respect of the compulsory acquisition of land and the creation and extinguishment of public rights is subject in and of itself to the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and Habitats Directive. Please confirm furthermore, that the board will require in respect of this application that it will be accompanied by all necessary and relevant documentation such as to entitle the board to comply with its obligations under the aforesaid Directives. Furthermore, please confirm that the necessary notice will be posted to advise the public of their entitlement to participate in the process and clarify how the deficiencies in the documentation accompany the application for the confirmation of the CPO will be addressed.	Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures are implemented in full the Proposed Scheme, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites. The NIS, in conjunction with detailed information in the EIAR, specifically deals with effects on all hydrologically connected Special Areas of Conservation.

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>It is noted that the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage state the following in their submission in the context of nature conservation with respect to the Proposed Scheme: "Having considered the documentation supporting this road scheme application, and in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS), the Department is satisfied in general that the approaches set out in these documents with regards to both the design of the project and the adoption of measures to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on plants, animals and habitats during its construction and operation should result in the minimisation of such impacts to the extent that no significant negative effects should result to flora or fauna including Qualifying Interests (QIs) for local European sites from the scheme's implementation as proposed. It is considered that if the measures set out in the EIAR and NIS to avoid and reduce possible adverse impacts on flora, fauna and habitats are diligently implemented in accordance with the methodologies proposed, any significant potential adverse effects on plants and animals can be avoided, including any effects on species which are QIs for the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Protection Area (SPA) which the road scheme is to traverse or for the downstream Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC and Boyne Estuary SPA."</p>
6	<p>Given the extent of the controversy that has arisen from this proposed scheme I would request an oral hearing as it is not possible through a written submission to deal adequately with conflicts of fact, the conflict of evidence, the Mistake of fact and the complexity of national and European law, The consequences of the previous board decision and the extent to which the board are entitled to depart from their previous decision, but above all, the sensitivity and vulnerability of this site which because of its designation as a World Heritage site, because of its international importance as an archaeological, heritage and cultural site, its European importance as ecological, biodiversity and ornithology importance. And because of the extent of the visual vulnerability of the site. Which in the context of the scale and extent of the development proposed cannot be resolved other than by way of an oral hearing.</p>	<p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>
7	<p><u>Issues</u> The Boyne Valley World Heritage Site is a premier national site of Irish Heritage. It is an Internationally recognised site of Outstanding Universal Value. The intrusion of the proposed by-pass into the Boyne Valley so close to the western boundary of the Buffer Zone of the World Heritage Site is an irreversible unnecessary proposal which will have detrimental impact on the integrity of the Bru na Bóinne ensemble. Our understanding of the extent of cultural artifacts and heritage in the Boyne Valley is evolving by the day. The discoveries made in 2018 and since show how much may yet to be learned about the true extent and significance of the World Heritage Site. Our knowledge of how rich is the heritage of Bru na Boinne has been enhanced since the refusal by An Bord of the last application for a by-pass. No sufficient case has been made by the promoters of the by-pass solution for An Bord to change its position.</p>	<p>Recent archaeological discoveries relevant to the World Heritage Property are discussed in Section 4 of the HIA (EIAR Appendix 13.1). The results of the 2018 aerial reconnaissance referred to by Mr Rogers are discussed in para 4.16 of the HIA. The discovery of multiple major Neolithic ritual sites add greatly to our understanding of the nature of the ritual landscape of Brú na Bóinne. However, as is noted in para 4.16, all of these newly discovered sites lie within the existing boundary of the World Heritage Property. The aerial reconnaissance also included the area between Slane and the World Heritage Property and no new comparable monuments were revealed here. The findings therefore reinforce our existing understanding of the extent of the ritual landscape within the bend of the Boyne and do not increase the sensitivity of the land area affected by the Proposed Scheme. An aerial survey was also carried out in June 2018 to inform the project at route selection stage (as described in Chapter 13, Section 13.3.1.2.6), covering the landscape surrounding Slane village, on</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		its east and west sides. Despite the perfect conditions provided by the drought, no new comparable monuments were identified.
8	<p><u>Necessity</u></p> <p>There is no need for this by-pass proposal. The traffic congestion in Slane could have been resolved years ago by restricting HGVs from using the N2. The N33 was intended as the route which would relieve Slane, Collon and Ardee. Neither Meath County Council nor other responsible authorities have taken steps to ensure the N33 solution was adopted. Dublin City Council have recently shown how traffic management solutions can be used to resolve city congestion. A traffic management approach has never been adopted or attempted for Slane.</p> <p>The need to enhance road safety in Slane can be resolved immediately with a HGV ban. No economic necessity has been shown that would justify driving the proposed trenched highway and bridge so close to Knowth, a protected structure of Outstanding Universal Value.</p> <p>Will the project be effective in resolving Slane's congestion? The proposal is not a proposal for a bypass of Slane. The design of the proposed new N2 is not orbital so it will not resolve the congestion arising from traffic running west and east through Slane. In fact, it is demonstrable that this "new" proposal will bring more traffic to parts of the village. So, the proposal lacks justification because it will not resolve congestion in Slane and there is in fact an immediate cost effective solution available, a HGV ban, which will force the north/south HGV traffic on to the M1.</p>	<p>Section 2.3 of EIAR Chapter 2 Background and Need for the Scheme describes the specific need for the scheme. In this section, the sub-standard existing N2 as it passes through Slane is described in detail, also referencing the considerable road safety risk and the long history of traffic collisions including fatalities at Slane associated with the existing situation. This section also describes the existing high HGV traffic volumes that pass through Slane on the N2 as contributing significantly to the road safety risk and adverse environmental conditions within the village.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of EIAR Chapter 2 describes the Planning and Policy context of the Proposed Scheme, demonstrating that the Proposed Scheme is well supported within National, Regional and Local policies.</p> <p>EIAR Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport, in Section 7.3 describes the baseline traffic conditions in the study area and within Slane village in Section 7.3.2. Both the N2 and the N51 in Slane village carry significant volumes of both general traffic and HGVs. Congestion and queues often occur, causing delay and adverse environmental conditions.</p> <p>Section 1.2 of EIAR Chapter 1 – Introduction describes the Aims of the Scheme. Key aims are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a multi-modal transport solution to improve a wide range of transport and other social needs within the study area;</li> <li>• Improve road safety along the N2 through Slane village;</li> <li>• To remove the existing 'bottle-neck' at Slane from the national road network;</li> <li>• To provide a safer road network in Slane and on the wider strategic road network.</li> <li>• To provide active travel connectivity locally and regionally;</li> <li>• To improve environmental quality in Slane village;</li> <li>• To provide for new electric vehicle charging points;</li> <li>• To improve the movement of freight and other HGV traffic;</li> <li>• To enhance the village centre as a viable, vibrant and attractive location;</li> </ul> <p>The need for the Scheme is established by identifying the road safety, transport and environmental problems it seeks to resolve/improve and as a result achieve the outcomes described as the aims of the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Alternative Solutions</b></p> <p>The submission suggests that an alternative is to restrict HGVs from using the N2 – and for HGV traffic to use the N33 and M1 as an alternative route. Imposing a HGV ban on the N2 will divert HGVs to the M1/N33.</p> <p>EIAR Chapter 3 Consideration of Alternatives provides a description of the alternatives considered during the evolution of the Proposed Scheme through the option selection and design stages, taking into account environmental considerations.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>This chapter provides a description of the phased and multi-criteria assessment approach taken in the option selection process.</p> <p>A brief summary of the phased multi-criteria assessment of options and alternatives considered is described in Section 3.3 of the EIAR. The complete option selection process was an in-depth assessment and is comprehensively described in the Options Selection Report contained in EIAR Vol. 4A Appendix 3.1. Various bypass options and various alternative traffic management type solutions were assessed.</p> <p>As described in Section 3.3.3, the preferred option was chosen based on a balanced assessment of the effects of Scheme. The preferred option achieved the best balance of positive and negative effects compared to the other options and alternatives.</p> <p>As the submission suggests that some form of traffic management alternative is the preferred solution, we provide description below on the detailed analysis carried out by reference to the relevant parts of the EIAR.</p> <p>As noted above, EIAR Appendix 3.1 contains the complete Option Selection Report prepared for the scheme.</p> <p>Section 4.4 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report describes the approach taken to the assessment of Traffic Management Alternatives. Six different types of measures were considered – different ways of potentially achieving HGV traffic reduction in Slane Village and at Slane Bridge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Measures involving legal prohibition of Heavy Goods Vehicles (as the vehicle type with the greatest individual significance to the human environment) at locations around Slane, including on the N2 at or near Slane Bridge.</li> <li>2. Measures involving new barrier-free tolls at locations around Slane, including on the N2 at or near Slane Bridge.</li> <li>3. Measures involving reduction or removal of existing motorway tolls so as to attract traffic away from Slane.</li> <li>4. Measures involving increases in journey time on the N2 to discourage traffic from choosing this route.</li> <li>5. Measures involving schemes to reduce journey times on the principal alternative routes.</li> <li>6. Measures involving attracting journeys away from the car altogether, to other modes of transport.</li> </ol> <p>A structured approach was taken to the identification and analysis of the various traffic management alternatives identified.</p> <p>Appendix M to Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report initially summarised the status of previous studies conducted. Section 1.3 of this document describes the various analyses carried out during the period 2012 and 2015 in relation to the assessment of traffic management alternatives.</p> <p>The objective of the measures considered is to provide traffic management measures to divert HGVs from Slane village. The studies assessed the effects of HGV toll measures including the</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>scenario of removing the HGV toll on the M1, HGV ban measures and other traffic management options. The results of the various analyses confirm that measures can be implemented which could achieve a reduction in the number of HGVs in Slane. The studies also acknowledged that achieving this outcome would have additional negative effects in terms of transport efficiency particularly for regions served by the N2 National Route between Ashbourne and Co Monaghan and that other less desirable routes for HGV traffic would likely experience increases in HGV traffic. Furthermore, all the measures are likely to have poor returns in terms of value for money and that public acceptance for most proposals is likely to be low.</p> <p>The option selection process for the Scheme sought to build on the previous work carried out and to assess traffic management alternatives using the phased multi-criteria assessment approach described in EIAR Chapter 3.</p> <p>The details of the measures assessed are described in Sections 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report. Measures include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV ban options</li> <li>• Tolling options</li> <li>• Removal of toll options</li> <li>• N2 Route Disimprovements</li> <li>• Improvements to alternative routes</li> <li>• Improvements to alternative modes</li> </ul> <p>Section 6.3 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report describes the Stage 1 appraisal process where the options are firstly sifted out where they offer little or no tangible benefit to Slane village and are clearly very poor value for money. The second stage consisted of a more detailed analysis, utilising output from the Traffic Model to assess the following in more detail;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Predicted traffic relief in Slane</li> <li>2. Comparative impact on the wider road network</li> <li>3. Economy</li> <li>4. Financial</li> </ol> <p>The analysis is described in detail in Appendix 3.1, Section 6.3.</p> <p>The outcome of this initial analysis was the identification of the best performing options to be taken forward for Stage 2 Appraisal. These options were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative A1 - Slane &amp; Broadboyne bridges - ban all HCV as the best non-tolling option</li> <li>• Alternative A2 as A1 but also ban at N51 W of village as the TM option that gives most traffic relief to Slane village</li> <li>• Alternative A3 - HCV ban Broadboyne, toll on Slane bridge, reduce tolls M1 J9 as the measure which offers best value for money.</li> </ul>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative A4 – Remove HGV tolls on the M1 and M3 and ban 5+axle HGVs at Slane Bridge &amp; Broadboyne Bridge as an option that has least negative impact on the local road network.</li> </ul> <p>Section 7.3.3 of Appendix 3.1 describes the traffic impact of the traffic management alternatives in terms of their impact in Slane village, impact on the N2 corridor, impact on the M1 corridor and impact on the wider road network.</p> <p>The alternatives are shown to be capable of achieving significant reductions in the numbers of HGVs in Slane village (Table 7-21 refers). However, the overall impact on total traffic volumes is minimal (by removing HGV content, other traffic is attracted to the N2 corridor) and that peak hour congestion would continue to occur (Tables 7-18 to 7-20 refer). The overall traffic impact on the N2 corridor is the reduction in HGV content but the overall impact is small (Table 7-22 refers). Broadly, the impact on the M1 corridor is a corresponding increase in HGV traffic (Table 7-23 refers). The impact on the wider road network varies somewhat between the options, but the notable impact is the increase in HGV traffic on routes and in other villages between the N2 and M1 (Table 7-24). This is a highly undesirable effect to divert additional HGV traffic to routes/villages that are not considered suitable for the reassignment of this traffic from an existing national primary route.</p> <p>Section 7.3.3.5 of Appendix 3.1 describes the conclusions of Traffic Management Alternatives Traffic Assessment. It is acknowledged that the alternatives are capable of removing HGV traffic from Slane village but this benefit is out-weighed by other effects which do little further in terms of overall traffic volumes in the village with existing congestion unresolved. The road safety risk in Slane would not be resolved by the alternatives and the 'bottle-neck' effect on the N2 route would be retained. Crucially, additional road safety risk would be transferred to other parts of the road network, which are not suitable for such increase in risk.</p> <p>The analysis draws the following over-arching conclusion;</p> <p>The principal conclusion is that it is not an appropriate road management strategy to divert HGVs from a national primary road (albeit a poor standard section) onto lower standard less safe regional roads introducing new road safety risks. This is contrary to the proper management of the area wide road network.</p> <p>The proper course of action is to implement improvement to the sub-standard national primary route and for HGV traffic to be retained on the national primary route.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above assessment the traffic management alternatives were included within the multi-criteria assessment described in detail in Section 8 of Appendix 3.1.</p> <p>The Economic appraisal concludes that the traffic management alternatives rank as either poor or least preferred. Relatively low implementation costs are offset by little or no transport economic benefit.</p> <p>Clearly, the traffic management alternatives are overall preferred from the Environment appraisal as there would be no impact on land acquisition and construction at new locations. However, it is noted these options are ranked as least preferred under Air Quality, Traffic Impact and Noise and Vibration due to the limited effects in Slane village. Similarly Architectural Heritage and Non-</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>agricultural properties score less well for the traffic management alternatives as there are reduced beneficial effects in Slane village.</p> <p>The Safety appraisal also ranks the traffic management alternatives as least preferred. This is primarily due to the road safety risks on the N2 in Slane are at best only partially addressed by these options.</p> <p>The discerning criteria under the Accessibility criterion is the extent to which options reduce traffic congestion and remove significant volumes of HCVs from Slane village to improve the ability of all of the communities in and around Slane village to access on foot the facilities, amenities and employment opportunities in Slane. Considering that the bypass options do not relieve all the traffic in Slane, traffic management alternative A2 (achieves best HGV reduction in the village) is assessed to be preferred along with each of the bypass options.</p> <p>The Integration criterion considers how well the proposed investment fits with other elements of Government transport and non-transport policy. Under this criteria, the traffic management alternatives score ranges from least preferred to intermediate.</p> <p>The Physical Activity criterion considers the benefit of a project to facilitating increased physical activity. The traffic management alternatives are assessed as least preferred under this heading.</p> <p>Section 9 of Appendix 3.1 documents in detail the preferred option selection decision process. In terms of the traffic management alternatives, the over-arching conclusion described in Section 9.2.3 is that each traffic management option is shown to be capable of reducing the number of HGVs in Slane, particularly on the N2. However, these options do not adequately address the problems in Slane as noted and combining this with the highly negative effect of transferring further road safety risk onto other unsuitable roads/villages lead to the overall conclusion that the appropriate course of action is to implement improvement to the sub-standard N2 national primary road.</p> <p>The analysis in Appendix 3.1 shows that this can realistically be only achieved by implementing a bypass solution.</p> <p><b>East-West Traffic</b></p> <p>The consideration of alternatives included an assessment of East-West orbital routes. This assessment is described in EIAR Chapter 3 Consideration of alternatives in Section 3.3.4. The options considered consist of a Do Minimum Option, which is effectively the preferred North-South bypass option plus four other options consisting of the Do Minimum plus an East-West orbital route. Section 3.3.4 provides a high level summary of the multi-criteria assessment carried out and concludes that the Do-Minimum (north-south bypass only) emerged as the preferred option as it offers best value for money at a reduced negative impact to the environment, particularly the natural environment compared to the other options. The benefit offered by east-west orbitals of further reductions in traffic in Slane is counteracted by increased environmental impact, most notably ecological, landscape and visual and agricultural impacts.</p>



<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report contains details of the in-depth analysis carried out on the potential east-west orbital options. Section 10 and Appendix N of this report describes the analysis carried out in detail.</p> <p>With the identification of the preferred North-south option, it is recognised that this provision does not relieve Slane village of all traffic. A residual of east-west traffic demand remains. The assessment of options to provide an East-West orbital was undertaken to assess if there was a viable means of providing further traffic relief within the village. As noted above, these options were assessed in conjunction with a Do Minimum scenario of just providing a North-South bypass.</p> <p>Four options (I, J, K and L) were generated within the north-west quadrant as options within the south-west quadrant were not considered feasible, primarily due to the adverse ecological impact of another River Boyne crossing the SPA/SAC, within a more highly vegetated location where the direct impact would be likely to be more severe (in comparison to the location chosen for the preferred North-South bypass), given that Annex I priority habitat in the form of residual alluvial woodland is found along the southern side of the River Boyne at these crossing locations.</p> <p>A multi-criteria assessment of the options was carried out under the headings of Environment, Economy, Safety and Engineering.</p> <p>The feasible East-West options are constrained by the local constraints, and as a result are longer in length compared to the North-South bypass. As a result, the cost of providing these routes is comparatively more costly. Additionally, the traffic reassigning to the East-West routes is also affected by the lengths of the options. The longer the option, the less transport benefit (time saving) for south-west and east-west traffic and the less of this traffic cohort that would reassign and hence remain within Slane village. Appendix N in Appendix 3.1 provides further details on this effect, showing there are very marginal travel time differences for some traffic between using the orbital route and remaining within the village.</p> <p>At that point in the scheme design, proposed traffic management measures within Slane village were introduced into the Proposed Scheme. These measures included re-configuring the N2/N51 junction in Slane to remove the traffic lights and reduce the junction to a simple cross-roads type junction. Carriageway narrowing and speed limits within the village were also added. These provisions have the effect of encouraging more traffic to utilise the orbital routes. These measures were therefore included within the Do Minimum scenario.</p> <p>The Safety appraisal consisted of an analysis of the options utilising a Road Safety Impact Assessment and a Stage F Road Safety Audit of the options. All orbital route options scored Preferred under the Road Safety Impact Assessment and all represent significant road safety improvement of the N2 and N51 routes under the Road Safety Audit. However, a quantitative estimate of network-wide safety benefits using the COBALT spreadsheet, described in Section 8.5 of Appendix N to Appendix 3.1 demonstrates that the calculated safety benefits deriving from including the orbital routes within the overall scheme results in only marginal changes to monetised safety benefits, which would not be considered to be significant.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>Under Engineering, all options are assessed to satisfactorily meet design standard and performance criteria.</p> <p>As noted above, all of the orbital routes provide only marginal journey time savings for a notable cohort of traffic. As a result, the transport benefits calculated are not significant, with the majority of benefits being generated by the North-South bypass on its own. Therefore, considering the additional cost of providing the orbital options, the overall effect is to reduce the Benefit:Cost Ratio (BCR) for the scheme. Refer to Section 8.3 of Appendix N to Appendix 3.1 Option Selection Report for further details.</p> <p>The assessment of the options under the Environment heading is described in detail in Section 8.4 of Appendix N to Appendix 3.1 Option Selection Report.</p> <p>The assessment of the various environmental aspects results in plusses and minuses for the orbital route options. Benefits in terms of air quality, noise and traffic impact in Slane village are offset by increased environmental impact within the natural environment and cultural heritage associated with the new route alignments.</p> <p>Taking into account the results of the multi-criteria analysis carried out, the Do Minimum (north-south bypass only) emerges as the preferred option. This option offers best value for money at a reduced negative impact to the environment, particularly the natural environment compared to the other options. The benefit of further reductions in traffic in Slane with east-west bypasses in place is counteracted by increased environmental impact, most notably ecological, landscape and visual and agricultural impacts. The increase in monetised transport benefit from an east-west bypass compared to the north-south bypass only is marginal and is out-weighed by the increase in cost, hence there is a negative impact on the BCR, representing a reduction in the value for money by the implementation of the additional infrastructure.</p> <p>The above conclusion was also accompanied by the recommendation that an appropriately designed public realm improvement in the village incorporating traffic management proposals which best manage the residual traffic volumes which continue to utilise the roads in Slane would be incorporated into the overall scheme.</p> <p>The further design development resulted in the scope of public realm and traffic management measures within Slane being included in the Proposed Scheme. The measures included within the design to best manage the residual east-west traffic travelling through the village are the redesign of the N2/N51 junction (the 'Square') to single lane approach priority controlled junction, with priority given to east-west traffic. The design is to allow east-west traffic pass through the village in the most efficient way and without delay. The design also includes traffic calming measures to ensure speeds are reduced. These provisions will permit the east-west traffic to pass through the village safely and efficiently. Only when the proposed pedestrian traffic light controlled facilities are activated will it be necessary for east-west traffic to stop. Refer to Section 4.4.13 of Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Scheme for full detailed description of the public realm and traffic management proposals in Slane.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Chapter 7 Traffic and Transportation contains, in Section 7.4.2.2 a comparison between the Do Scheme and the Do Minimum scenario in Slane village. The following description of traffic effects from Section 7.4.2.2 in Slane is notable;</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme is predicted to divert the vast majority of traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, from the existing N2 through Slane. This is a significant benefit, particularly as there are sensitive receptors such as the local primary school along this route and significant traffic volumes, including HGVs, are diverted from the existing sub-standard Slane bridge across the Boyne.</p> <p>The overall impact of the north-south bypass on the predicted traffic on the N51 in the village is less beneficial. Providing the bypass and proposed traffic management measures in Slane will increase traffic, including HGVs, on the N51 Link between the centre of village and the bypass. This predicted increase in traffic is predominantly attributable to the reassignment of significant portions of north-west and south-west traffic to the bypass when the scheme is implemented. This is also a key reason why the turning movements at the 'Square' are significantly reduced. HGV turning movements at the 'Square' are practically eliminated due to the HGV bans diverting all these movements to the bypass. The north-west and majority of south-west traffic now passes through the village as 'straight ahead' movements rather than turning movements at the junction. Only locally generated HGV traffic including services, e.g. bin lorries, are expected to need to make turns at the 'Square' in this scenario. With the proposed bypass in place the patterns of traffic change significantly, with less right-turning at the 'Square' being a significant benefit.</p> <p>Due to this fundamental change in traffic patterns in the village, it is appropriate to re-designate the junction at the 'Square' to favour the passage of east-west traffic under a priority control arrangement. The predominantly 'straight ahead' movements can pass through the village most safely and with the most efficiency. The proposed traffic management measures, including raised tables, signalised pedestrian crossings, designated gateway treatment and minimum carriageway widths, will reduce travel speed. This is a significantly safer and more efficient arrangement, albeit with the disadvantage of increasing traffic on the east side of the village.</p> <p>The impact on traffic on the N51 west of the junction is not significant with a slight decrease in total traffic with a slight increase in HGV content predicted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the increase in traffic predicted on the N51 between the village and the bypass, the overall traffic volumes travelling through Slane decrease significantly with the bypass in place, which will relieve congestion in the village allowing the existing road infrastructure to better cater for the residual traffic and allow for reallocation of road space for vulnerable road users.</p>
9	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>The plan in this application is to trench the N2 highway into the Boyne Valley. This is to despoil and transform forever the Boyne Valley landscape which is within the envelope of the Outstanding Universal Value World Heritage Site. The "development" of this landscape as envisaged is wholly at odds with the historic and cultural significance of the Boyne Valley where the development is proposed. It is also at odds with the protected status of the valley and the Boyne as Special Areas of Conservation. The development</p>	<p>As part of the EIAR a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out and is contained in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 12 – Landscape and Visual. The LVIA is supported by accompanying graphics, including photomontages of the Proposed Scheme (EIAR Volume 4C; Appendix 12.1 – Photomontages).</p> <p>As per Table 12-14 of Chapter 12 a summary of the predicted landscape effects for both Construction Phase and Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme is provided which concludes</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>will be at odds with European Union Environment and Heritage Legislation, and, indeed with national legislation.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact of Development on the OUV of the World Heritage Site The EIAR fails to place before An Bord the extent of these impacts. For instance, the M1 Business Park North is not referenced as having impact on the World Heritage Site, which cannot be correct as this development is clearly in view and intrusive from the summit of Dowth. There have been numerous developments of substantial agricultural buildings within the Buffer Zone. These are not referenced in the EIAR.</p>	<p>that following the successful implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in Section 12.5.3.1 of Chapter 12 the identified impacts are considered to reduce further.</p> <p>As part of the LVIA assessment a series of viewpoints have been selected, which include viewpoints from locations within the World Heritage Site and the Hill of Slane The visual impact assessment associated with these viewpoints has assessed Construction Phase and Operational Phase visual impacts and has concluded that no significant visual effect are predicted to be experienced from these locations during the Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The cumulative impact assessment referred to in the submission is set out in Section 11 of the HIA (EIAR Vol. 4B Appendix 13.1). This assessment considered the cumulative impact of developments in the setting of the World Heritage Property since inscription in 1993. Both ICOMOS Ireland and DHLGH were consulted on the scope and methods of the assessment. The results of the assessment were first presented in the Route Options Study in 2019 and no critical comment was received at that time about the scope of the study. It is therefore considered to be a robust assessment which would not be materially changed by the inclusion of the M1 Business Park North.</p> <p>A comprehensive Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIAR and this is detailed in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 16 – Biodiversity: Aquatic Ecology. These assessments identified design measures which have been integrated to avoid/reduce impacts in the first instance, and includes mitigation and monitoring measures to address significant effects which are set out within Chapters 15 and 16, as well as Chapter 27 – Schedule of Environmental Commitments.</p> <p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s).</p> <p>The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures are implemented in full the Proposed Scheme, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites. The NIS, in conjunction with detailed information in the EIAR, specifically deals with effects on all hydrologically connected Special Areas of Conservation.</p>
10	<p><u>Boyne and Blackwater SAC and SPA</u></p> <p>The EIAR fails to fully explore the potential impact on red listed species (e.g. Barn Owls) and water dependent species (e.g. Daubenton Bats) that may be impacted by the lighting and traffic on the proposed bridge. Given the location of the bridge, within an SPA and SAC, it is clear that there will be impacts on such species and it is my contention that this has not been explored to its full extent.</p> <p>Given the significant depth of trench that is being proposed for the road and bridge on the southern and northern side of the Boyne river at Slane, I am concerned that there has not been appropriate consideration in the EIAR of the impact on hydro morphological changes within the groundwater structures and the impact on nearby Tufa formations, Tufa springs</p>	<p>With respect to the undertaking of a comprehensive Ecological Impact Assessment for the Proposed Scheme, refer to the response to Item 9.</p> <p>The EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology provides a comprehensive consideration and assessment of the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the range of habitats and species relevant to the receiving environment into which the scheme will be constructed and operated. This has been informed by desktop data-gathering from key data holders on biodiversity resources for the area, alongside both general and specific site survey work which included overwintering vantage point surveys, surveys for wintering and breeding birds and building surveys for any buildings to be impacted. Based on this desktop analysis, site surveys and consultation by a team of professional ecologists, no sites were noted to be suitable to support Barn Owl territories.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>and Alkaline fens (notably qualify interests) within the SAC. For example, the springs found at Crew bane and within the Crew bane Marsh.</p> <p>The recent purchase of the national park at Dowth Hall highlights the importance of the Boyne and Blackwater SAC and SPA in a national context. The proposed road and bridge will lead to further degradation of the Boyne and Blackwater SAC and SPA. There has been considerable infrastructure building within the SPA and SAC over the past two decades. Effectively, this is death by 1000 cuts to the integrity of the SAC and SPA. It will lead to future declines in this precious ecosystem &amp; habitat that is becoming so rare on this island. There is a higher standard of investigation required to ensure the protection of this.</p>	<p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures are implemented in full the Proposed Scheme, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites. The NIS, in conjunction with detailed information in the EIAR, specifically deals with effects on all hydrologically connected Special Areas of Conservation.</p> <p>EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology, Section 15.2.3 and Chapter 16 – Biodiversity: Aquatic Ecology, Section 16.2.3 (Sources of Information to Inform the Assessment) sets out the details of the desktop and site-specific surveys that have been undertaken. All field surveys were undertaken using professional interpretation and application of the guidance, systems and methods referred to in the text describing each survey method. The NRA Ecological Surveying Techniques for Protected Flora and Fauna during the Planning of National Road Schemes (2009) was also considered with regard to appropriate survey seasons and methods for many of Ireland’s protected species. Supporting information for the terrestrial ecology surveys is also contained in EIAR Vol. 4B Appendices 15.1 – 15.7.</p> <p>In the NIS, Section 3.4.1 (Desk Study) describes desktop study completed to provide contextual information to inform the NIS assessment, and to inform the surveys required to inform the NIS assessment. NIS Section 3.4.2 (Field Study) states that the NIS is also informed by the findings of ecological surveys of the Proposed Scheme, carried out by professional ecologists on various dates and across multiple years between 2017 and 2023. The findings of the surveys, along with the findings of the desk studies, provide the ecological baseline against which the effects on integrity of the Proposed Scheme on the relevant European sites are determined. The multi-disciplinary surveys assessed the potential for all Qualifying Interest (QIs)/ Species of Conservation Interest (SCIs) of European sites to occur, given their ecological requirements identified by Balmer et al. (2013) for birds, and the National Biodiversity Data Centre (NBDC) and National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) for all other species/habitats. The surveys included checks of suitable habitats for all highly mobile QI/ SCI species potentially occurring. Species surveys had regard for relevant guidance (e.g. NRA, 2009). A review of Ordnance Survey maps and of detailed aerial photography was also carried out to assist in delineating the extents and boundaries of different habitat types. Habitat surveys included checks for invasive species listed in the Third Schedule of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011, as amended, within the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme. Comprehensive bird surveys have also been undertaken.</p> <p>These field surveys relevant to the NIS are summarised in Table 3-2 of the NIS and the findings of the site visits for QIs/ SCIs for relevant European sites are provided in NIS Section 4 and Appendix 1 to the NIS (Natura Impact Statement Supporting Information).</p> <p>As detailed in the impact assessments contained in Chapters 15 and 16 of the EIAR as well as in the NIS, the significant impacts and pathways for effects were identified, assessed and mitigated.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>It is noted that the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage state the following in their submission in the context of nature conservation with respect to the Proposed Scheme: "Having considered the documentation supporting this road scheme application, and in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS), the Department is satisfied in general that the approaches set out in these documents with regards to both the design of the project and the adoption of measures to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on plants, animals and habitats during its construction and operation should result in the minimisation of such impacts to the extent that no significant negative effects should result to flora or fauna including Qualifying Interests (QIs) for local European sites from the scheme's implementation as proposed. It is considered that if the measures set out in the EIAR and NIS to avoid and reduce possible adverse impacts on flora, fauna and habitats are diligently implemented in accordance with the methodologies proposed, any significant potential adverse effects on plants and animals can be avoided, including any effects on species which are QIs for the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Protection Area (SPA) which the road scheme is to traverse or for the downstream Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC and Boyne Estuary SPA."</p> <p>Regarding hydromorphology and groundwater, EIAR Chapter 5 – Description of the Construction Phase provides a detailed description of the construction phase for the Proposed Scheme; Section 5.4.5 and 5.13 (Earthworks) provides details of the proposed scope of the earthworks activities, including volumes of cuttings. Section 5.13 provides detail of the proposed construction sequencing of earthworks activities designed to reduce the risk of environmental impacts, for instance from silt-laden run-off entering the River Boyne.</p> <p>Chapter 18 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Scheme upon hydrogeology (the groundwater regime). Chapter 18 notes there is one karst feature mapped by the Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI) in the vicinity of the site, a swallow hole in Crewbane. The assessment was based upon a range of data sources, including site specific geotechnical and geophysical investigations carried out between 2019 and 2021. Due consideration has been given in Chapter 18 to the potential impacts to bedrock aquifers and the Slane Public Water Supply. This assessment concluded that the significance of potential effects upon groundwater (both flow and quality) will be imperceptible pre-mitigation, and will remain imperceptible with the adoption of the range of robust mitigation measures outlined in Section 18.5, detailed for both the Construction Phase and the Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme. Mitigation and measures for the protection of groundwater resources is set out in Section 18.5.</p> <p>EIAR Vol. 2 EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 16 – Biodiversity: Aquatic Ecology have assessed potential effects upon designated sites within the study area, including Crewbane Marsh proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) [Site Code: 000553]. Mitigation Measures for the protection of designated sites including water quality and groundwater dependent features is included in Section 15.5 and 16.5.</p> <p>Regarding cumulative effects, EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 25 – Cumulative Effects presents the approach and methodology undertaken for the assessment of potential cumulative effects of Proposed</p>

<b>No.:</b>	06	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Jack Rogers	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Scheme with other existing and/or approved projects/developments, during the construction and operational/maintenance phases of the Proposed Scheme. The cumulative impact assessment (CIA) with existing developments in the area and other approved development for each topic of the EIAR has been fully assessed and compiled within each of the EIAR topic Chapters 7 – 23.</p> <p>Reference to Dowth Hall National Park is acknowledged within the appendix to Chapter 25, EIAR Vol. 4B, Appendix 25.1 – Stage 1 Initial Project Compilation. Under 'Other Considerations' at the time of submission of the EIAR to the Board (December 2023) the reference to Boyne Valley (Brú na Bóinne) National Park, located within Dowth Hall Demesne is based on a press release from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage; no further details were available at that time. Based on the available description of the location of the National Park provided in the press release, the Proposed Scheme is not anticipated to interfere with the establishment of the proposed national park or its functioning.</p>
11	<p><u>Oral Hearing</u> I trust An Bord will follow precedent and direct an Oral Hearing leading to a comprehensive report to An Bord.</p>	<p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	07	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	John and Mary Colgan (CPO 106)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowners objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed roundabout junction, the N2 Mainline and links to existing N2.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway regarding the realignment of existing drains that may be severed by the proposed new road and there are concerns about adverse drainage problems to the retained lands during and after the construction of the new road.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0001 and MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Where adjacent lands drain towards the road scheme, interceptor drainage is proposed alongside the earthworks to collect runoff and convey to a suitable outfall.</p> <p>It is noted that this matter is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>
4	<p><b>Access - General</b> We object to the lack of detail on access to the retained property.</p>	<p>The Proposed Scheme does not impact the existing access to these lands from the L1600 local road. As this existing access is to be retained, further access measures have not been deemed necessary for these lands.</p> <p>Access to lands during construction of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states that "Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and divided lands will, where practicable, be maintained by the contractor during construction of the Proposed</p>



<b>No.:</b>	07	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	John and Mary Colgan (CPO 106)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Scheme; otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided to and from divided land plots and to and from the public road network.”</p> <p>Access to lands following completion of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states, “Permanent access will be provided to all divided lands. Where required this access will be to and from the public road network and where appropriate the access will be by way of farm tracks and overbridges”.</p>
5	<p><b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted.
6	Our client’s primary concern is in relation to the impacts on their property rather than the overall proposed scheme itself.	Noted.
7	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanala Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	08	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	John Kealy (CPO 118)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be permanently acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed N2 Mainline, an overbridge for access to severed lands, an attenuation pond, and an access track for inspection / maintenance of attenuation pond and River Boyne bridge structure. Lands are also to be temporarily acquired, for duration of the project's construction, to allow access to bridge construction site.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway regarding the realignment of existing drains that may be severed by the proposed new road and there are concerns about adverse drainage problems to the retained lands during and after the construction of the new road.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0003 and MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0004 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Where adjacent lands drain towards the road scheme, interceptor drainage is proposed alongside the earthworks to collect runoff and convey to a suitable outfall.</p> <p>It is noted that the matter of drainage is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>
4	<p><b>Access - General</b> We object to the lack of detail on access to the retained property.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	08	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	John Kealy (CPO 118)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Access Track 3 is proposed to maintain access to the retained property and Overbridge 3 is proposed to connect severed lands.</p> <p>The designs of the proposed overbridges are described in Section 4.4.10.2 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>The design of Overbridge 3 is illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-ST05-N2-DR-D-BR0103-01 and MDT0806-RPS-ST05-N2-DR-D-BR0103-02 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Access to lands during construction of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states that "Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and divided lands will, where practicable, be maintained by the contractor during construction of the Proposed Scheme; otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided to and from divided land plots and to and from the public road network."</p> <p>Access to lands following completion of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states, "Permanent access will be provided to all divided lands. Where required this access will be to and from the public road network and where appropriate the access will be by way of farm tracks and overbridges".</p>
5	<p><b>Access Road Details</b> Insufficient information has been supplied regarding the proposed accommodation road.</p>	<p>As per Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4, access tracks will be constructed as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00706 and will generally have a pavement width of 4.0 m with 1.0 m wide grassed verges. The access tracks will be surfaced with a bituminous double surface dressing.</p> <p>The geometric design for Access Track 3 is illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-GE3005 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p>
6	<p><b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted.
7	Our Client's primary concern is in relation to the impacts on their property rather than the overall proposed scheme itself.	Noted.
8	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	09	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Joseph Coen (CPO 113)	
Item No.	Observation	Response
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b></p> <p>The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment. The property to be acquired is necessary as the noise impact exceeds acceptable thresholds and cannot otherwise be adequately mitigated. The landowner will be entitled to claim compensation arising from the CPO as part of a separate subsequent process.</p>
2	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>In relation to noise mitigation, my client does not believe that the clay bund that is being constructed along western side of his property is appropriate, The road is in cut and therefore the noise should be trapped within the cutting.</p>	<p>It is noted that the entirety of this dwelling and curtilage are to be acquired. Therefore, this landowner will have no retained lands at this location.</p> <p>The proposed bund is part of the scheme's landscaping mitigation including mitigating the impact of the project on views from the monument at Knowth, a UNESCO World Heritage Property. The bund and associated landscaping provides mitigation against the extent of the project visible from Knowth.</p> <p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p> <p>The dwelling relating to this submission is referenced as receptor R696/R696a. The predicted noise levels between the Do-Minimum (without Proposed Scheme) and Do-Something (with Proposed Scheme) scenario at this location increase. The predicted noise levels with the Proposed Scheme in place is 67 dB Lden at the most exposed façade of the dwelling. The predicted noise levels are above the 60 dB Lden design goal and qualifies for mitigation under the criteria outlined in Section 9.2.4.5. The mitigation measures proposed are detailed in Section 9.5.2 of the EIAR and include an earthen berm/false cut with a 76 m long by 3 m high reflective noise barrier on top. With mitigation measures in place the predicted noise level reduces from 66 dB Lden to 62 dB Lden for the opening year and from 67 dB Lden to 63 dB Lden in the design year (2041). The Do-Something noise level in the opening year and design year remains above the design goal of 60 dB Lden, despite the application of a structured approach to mitigation measures.</p> <p>As the noise mitigation does not achieve the design goal, it is proposed to acquire this property under CPO.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	09	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Joseph Coen (CPO 113)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
3	<p><b>Route Selection</b>                      If a different route had been chosen, my client's property would not be impacted at all. My client is very concerned in relation to the current Proposed Scheme</p>	<p>A comprehensive options selection process has been carried out to identify the preferred route for this scheme. This is documented in the N2 Slane Option Selection Report as provided in Appendix 3.1 of the EIAR.</p>
4	<p><b>Other Matters</b>                      Such other relevant matters may arise</p>	<p>Noted</p>
5	<p>The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.                      An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	10	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Reps of Nangle Family (CPO 108)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed N2 Mainline and overbridge for access to severed lands.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway regarding the realignment of existing drains that may be severed by the proposed new road and there are concerns about adverse drainage problems to the retained lands during and after the construction of the new road.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0001 and MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Where adjacent lands drain towards the road scheme, interceptor drainage is proposed alongside the earthworks to collect runoff and convey to a suitable outfall.</p> <p>It is noted that the matter of drainage is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>

<b>No.:</b>	10	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Reps of Nangle Family (CPO 108)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
4	<p><b>Access and Over Bridge</b></p> <p>There is additional information needed in relation to the exact design of the over bridge and this is a matter of significant concern to the property owner.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0001 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Overbridge 1 is proposed to provide access between severed lands.</p> <p>The designs of the proposed overbridges are described in Section 4.4.10.2 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>The design of Overbridge 1 is illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-ST03-N2-DR-D-BR0103-01 and MDT0806-RPS-ST03-N2-DR-D-BR0103-02 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>As per Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4, access tracks will be constructed as per TII CC-SCD-00706 and will generally have a pavement width of approximately 4.0 m with approximately 1.0 m wide grassed verges.</p>
5	<p><b>Other Matters</b></p> <p>Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted
6	<p>The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	11	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Mark Laird (CPO 100/101/103)	
Item No.	Observation	Response
1	<p>We must point out that our submission to the Bord is not in opposition to the merits of the proposed scheme, to which my client has no objection, but to land ownership and occupancy details as set out in the various schedules published as part of the public notification process.</p> <p>There are two sections of land where my client has an interest, namely:-</p> <p><b>Section 1</b></p> <p>Land located to the east of the existing N2, which we have shaded green on the enclosed copy of a land registry map. This section of land is required for the construction of the CPO as published and my client's interest has not been recognised by the Council.</p> <p>In regards to the above, this section of land is registered to Meath County Council and as such my client's interest in same was not included in the CPO schedule, part of Meath Folios MH70199F &amp; 702027F refers. Our research shows that this section of land was acquired by the Council in November 1968 (over 50 years ago) for the improvement of the N2 just south of Slane Village. The shaded area was part of a larger land acquisition. The full land take was not used for the completed road works, this was normal practice. To illustrate, the new road construction at Johnstown involved both a realignment of the carriageway and the raising of road levels on the N2 at Johnstown. The land take at the time would have allowed the Council to construct the new realigned road embankment and the associated side slopes together with a working area for construction purposes. The finished works also involved the erection of a concrete post and rail roadside fence separating the new road from adjoining land. This fence was erected at the top of the embankment at the level of the new road. The land on the field side of the new fence reverted to the landowner. In this case both the side slopes of the new embankment and the working spaces were left as part of the agricultural field. There was no formal transferring of the said section of land back to the farmer. It must be stressed that for road schemes at the time, the future maintenance of new fences after their erection became the responsibility of the landowner. We would add that the concrete post and rail fence was a type of fence usually associated with new road schemes carried out by County Councils. In effect, the shaded area is part of the land formally acquired by the Council that reverted to the landowner from whom they acquired the lands.</p> <p>My client acquired his holding from Gerard, Karol and Paul Halpin in November 1998. Since then he has worked his holding including the lands that are the subject of this submission, in effect for well over the period where "squatter's title" would apply. We understand that the Halpin brothers also worked the section of land that is the subject of this submission. In working his holding, Mark Laird also maintained the said concrete post and rail roadside boundary fence that was erected by the council.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation to the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The Council is prepared to accede to the request and will apply to An Bord Pleanála to amend the CPO schedule to include the asserted claim as owner/reputed owner of the lands in question noting that the CPO schedule is not definitive as to the entitlement or otherwise of the interests listed therein.</p> <p>It is noted that CPO Plot 100a.1 is within the existing N2 road boundary and does not extend into the lands occupied by Mr. Laird.</p> <p>CPO plot 100b.2, to be temporarily acquired to allow construction of proposed field access, is within lands worked by Mr. Laird. Therefore, Mr. Laird has been named as an occupier of these lands.</p>



<b>No.:</b>	11	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Mark Laird (CPO 100/101/103)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>After the acquisition of the land, Mark Laird applied for planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling on his land and was granted same by Meath County Council. Planning File 01/4295 refers. The erection of this new dwelling included the construction of a new recessed entrance across the shaded area. The house and associated new entrance was erected in 2002/3.</p> <p>There is a serious issue arising about the validity of the CPO arising from the omission of the Council to include our client interest in the subject lands in the published schedules. We would contend that our client's interest in the shaded lands should have been included in the CPO scheme and associated documentation, naming our client as the "reputed owner" or at least "occupier" of the said lands.</p> <p>We would indicate to the Bord that our client's Solicitor, Mr. Patrick Branigan, will be putting procedures in place to rectify the ownership issue and register the lands in question in our client's name. As we previously indicated my client has no objection to the scheme as designed but will be asking the Council to concede formally that our client is the legitimate owner of the shaded lands. If they agree the matter will then become an issue for compensation if the CPO scheme as published is confirmed and would allow Mark Laird to withdraw this submission.</p> <p>We would have no objection to the Bord referring this matter to the Council for their consideration in the interim.</p>	
2	<p><b>Section 2</b></p> <p>We would refer the Bord to section 101a.2 in the schedule where our client is listed as having only an "occupier" interest in the section of land that is so designated. We would contend that our client is the full owner of the said section of land. Again, we would indicate that Mr. Branigan will be putting procedures in place to rectify the land registration situation in our clients favour.</p>	<p>The Council is prepared to accede to the request and amend the CPO schedule to include the asserted claim as owner/reputed owner and/or occupier of the lands in question noting that the CPO schedule is not definitive as to the entitlement or otherwise of the interests listed therein.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	12	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michael and Elaine Cully (CPO 149)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b></p> <p>There is no need for the Council to acquire the grass verge outside our boundary as there seems to be no plans set out for any kerbs &amp; pavements within our vicinity according to Vol.3.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>As illustrated on General Arrangement drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-GA0003, contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR, it is proposed to provide a new footpath on this side of the road extending from the Grassland Agro entrance to the proposed N2 Bypass. New kerbing will be provided with this footpath including drop kerbs at property entrances.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>We are concerned in relation to the impact of the scheme on the drainage of our property due to the possible level of the road outside our property if the road were to be raised at any point which would cause storm runoff into our property.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing numbers MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0006 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Gullies and carrier drains are proposed at this location to collect surface water runoff and convey to suitable outfall. The drainage system is designed to prevent runoff from the road encroaching this property.</p> <p>There is no proposal to raise the existing road. However, kerbing will be provided to facilitate the proposed footpath.</p>
3	<p><b>Access &amp; Road layout</b></p> <p>We are concerned in relation to the road layout situated between Grasslands Agro and our property. The current layout is dangerous as the road leading out of Slane splits into two lanes which encourages vehicles to speed which is a Health &amp; Safety issue to myself and my neighbours when indicating into our properties as vehicles will not slow down which there have been multiple near-hit experiences. There is no section available in Vol.3. showing new possible layouts including road markings that would ensure that this Health &amp; Safety matter is dealt with appropriately and would be a welcome addition towards Vision Zero as set out by the Road Safety Authority which would minimise a possible accident in the area.</p>	<p>Following construction of the proposed N2 Slane Bypass, it is expected that the existing road at this property would be reclassified as a local road with lower speed limit.</p> <p>Traffic on this road will also reduce very significantly with the proposed bypass in place.</p> <p>It is also expected that traffic approaching and departing the roundabout, proposed near this location, would be travelling at a slower speed than traffic on the existing open road.</p> <p>The design of the road layout will take account of the above and it will be reconfigured (in terms of number of lanes and carriageway widths) in the further development of the design.</p>
4	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <p>Some of the data regarding Appendix 15.4 Protected Fauna seems outdated as the oldest record is from 2011. We are now in 2024 and the landscape is changing due to environmental factors, farming practices etc. Fauna such as Barn owls, Pine martens and a Goldcrest (Regulus regulus) have been observed by myself recently so it would be appropriate that measures including Barn owl boxes be installed within the vicinity etc.</p>	<p>The Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) submitted as part of the application for development consent for the proposed N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme') assesses the potential effects of the development on the environment. The EIAR chapters provide a robust impact assessment on the environmental factors in accordance with the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended (the 'EIA Directive'). Where significant effects have been identified within these EIAR Chapters, appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures have been developed to reduce the potential negative effects of the Proposed Scheme on the environment. The</p>

<b>No.:</b>	12	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michael and Elaine Cully (CPO 149)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>EIAR has been prepared in accordance with best practice guidelines on EIA, including Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) guidelines, as well as topic-specific guidelines including the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA).</p> <p>A comprehensive Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIAR and this is detailed in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 15 – Biodiversity: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 16 – Biodiversity: Aquatic Ecology. These assessments identified design measures which have been integrated to avoid/reduce impacts in the first instance, and includes mitigation and monitoring measures to address significant effects which are set out in EIAR Vol. 2, Chapter 27 – Schedule of Environmental Commitments. With regards to surveys, Chapter 15, Section 15.2.3 and Chapter 16, Section 16.2.3 (Sources of Information to Inform the Assessment) sets out the details of the desktop and site-specific surveys that have been undertaken. All field surveys were undertaken using professional interpretation and application of the guidance, systems and methods referred to in the text describing each survey method. The NRA Ecological Surveying Techniques for Protected Flora and Fauna during the Planning of National Road Schemes (2009) was also considered with regard to appropriate survey seasons and methods for many of Ireland’s protected species.</p> <p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures were implemented in full the Proposed Project, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites.</p> <p>In addition, an Environmental Operating Plan (EOP) prepared in accordance with the TII Guidelines for the Creation, Implementation and Maintenance of an Environmental Operating Plan as part of the overall mitigation strategy, has been included in the EIAR (Vol. 4, Appendix 5.6). The EOP includes, in an appendix to it, the mitigation and monitoring measures relevant to the contractor from EIAR Chapter 27 – Schedule of Environmental Commitments. The contractor will take ownership of the EOP once appointed. EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 5, Section 5.10 Environmental Management During Construction, states that “MCC will ensure that all mitigation and monitoring committed to in the EIAR and NIS and planning conditions, will be enforced on the contractor through express terms of the contract, and will be overseen by an official engaged by the Council.”</p>
5	<p><b>Traffic Management</b></p> <p>Regarding Vol.4. Appendix 3 Traffic management measures considered Stage 1 sets out the possibility of a Toll on Slane bridge for all vehicles including Heavy vehicles. The possibility of a Toll at the bridge will lead to vehicles going through Slane to avoid the Toll which seems counterproductive considering targets need to be achieved for Air pollution values. Heavy vehicles such as Busses (Collins bus) require to go through</p>	<p>The submission appears to be referring to the reports provided in the Chapter 3 appendices (Consideration of Alternatives) within Volume 4 of the EIAR , which include details of the Option Selection Phase of the project. At that stage, Traffic Management Alternatives were assessed as part of this process.</p> <p>We confirm that a toll for HGVs crossing Slane bridge is not proposed as part of this scheme. However, the proposed traffic management elements within the proposed Public Realm design for Slane do include for a HGV ban on the existing N2 through the village. Local HGVs, including public</p>

<b>No.:</b>	12	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michael and Elaine Cully (CPO 149)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Slane village so there would need to be an exception within the Heavy vehicles ban through Slane for the bus.	transport vehicles serving Slane will be permitted to access locations within the HGV banned area in the village.
6	<b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.	Noted
7	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanala Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	Noted. An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Lack of Transparency:</b>                  We do not believe that we have been part of a transparent and consultative process. We purchased the house in 2021 and we have not been engaged by any planning authority in the process while our neighbours around us have been afforded consultation as part of the engagement process . We have made an effort to engage in public meetings on the subject of the N2 bypass to gain more information of the impact and voice our concerns but have yet to have a one to one discussion on the plan and potential impacts.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme has engaged in a comprehensive consultation process as detailed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) Chapter 6 (Consultation). Public consultations were held for the Proposed Scheme's study area and environmental constraints (27 July 2017), option selection (29 November 2017), and a series of three public consultations on the emerging preferred option (13 – 15 November 2019). A public information day was also held on 19 January 2023 (which Mr Garrigan attended and spoke with the project team) to provide an update on scheme progress and anticipated next steps for the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>A dedicated project website has been maintained throughout the Proposed Scheme. This website includes telephone and email contact details to facilitate direct contact from the public.</p> <p>The project team received an email from Mr Garrigan in March 2021 enquiring about the Proposed Scheme. A response issued by email directing Mr Garrigan to the Project Website for relevant information on the Proposed Scheme and providing phone/email contact details for a member of the project team.</p>
2	<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b>                  The proposed extinguishment of public right of way will have adverse effects on the environment in the immediate area, including disruption of natural habitats, increased traffic congestion, and air pollution right beside our property. We are very concerned that our neighbours house, who are only 30 meters from our boundary has been made subject to compulsory purchase order due to the projected noise levels once the bypass is complete. The potential impact of noise pollution on our family home is a matter of deep concern for us and without proper consultation, the potential environmental consequences remain unaddressed.</p>	<p>A temporary road closure is proposed for a section of the existing L16002 (Rossnaree Road) during construction of the proposed overbridge which will allow the local road to cross the proposed N2 Slane Bypass. Following completion of the works, a new public right of way will be implemented for the new section of the L16002 to replace the existing public right of way which is to be extinguished. This is described in EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Description of the Construction Phase, Section 5.5.1 (Traffic Management During Construction) which notes that diversions will be in place during the temporary road closure to facilitate local access: <i>Rossnaree Road L16002: The section of Rossnaree Road between the N2 and Access Points 2 and 3 is a critical site construction route. The existing road is narrow and a manned traffic controlled one-way system is proposed along the 245m length of existing road in order to manage and cater for the anticipated construction stage traffic demand. As Access Point 3 facilitates construction of the River Boyne bridge, abnormal loads are likely to deliver large plant (cranes) and bridge girders. Abnormal loads will be subject to statutory process and management.</i></p> <p><i>Temporary closure of the Rossnaree Road will be necessary late in the construction programme to facilitate the construction of the mainline in the area and also the proposed Rossnaree Road overbridge. The closure is expected to last for a period of eight to nine months. Diversions via McGruder's Cross will be in place in order to maintain local access during this temporary closure.</i></p> <p>With regards to rights of way/ rights of access, EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 21 – Material Assets: Non-agricultural Properties sets out mitigation measures relating specifically to rights of way/ rights of access; for the construction phase, Chapter 21, Section 21.5.1 states:</p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All drains, cables, conduits, pipes, rights of way and wayleaves etc. where such services are severed by the CPO during construction of the Proposed Scheme will be maintained or replaced, unless otherwise agreed with the landowner.</i></li> <li>• <i>MCC shall undertake to replace (either along the same or alternative routes) all existing rights of drainage, rights of access to the public road network and easements across the lands to be acquired.</i></li> </ul> <p>The mitigation measures for the operational phase relating specifically to rights of way/ rights of access are set out in Chapter 21, Section 21.5.2 which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All drains, cables, conduits, pipes, rights of way and wayleaves etc. where such services are severed by the CPO during operation of the Proposed Scheme will be maintained or replaced, unless otherwise agreed with the landowner.</i></li> <li>• <i>MCC shall undertake to replace (either along the same or alternative routes) all existing rights of drainage, rights of access to the public road network and easements across the lands to be acquired.</i></li> <li>• <i>Where required, access to and from the public road network and way-leaves and routing for all existing services, including water, sewerage, electricity etc. will be provided to all severed properties.</i></li> </ul> <p>Regarding noise pollution concerns, EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme. Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p> <p>This dwelling is reference R32 in Appendix 9.4 Operational Noise Predictions and 9.5 Operational Noise Predictions with Mitigation Measures. The predicted noise levels between the Do-Minimum (without scheme in place) and Do-Something (with the scheme) scenario at this dwelling will increase. However, the predicted noise levels do not exceed the NRA design goal of 60 dB Lden. The significance rating at this dwelling is Moderate. The rating for the other dwelling referred to is Significant.</p> <p>In terms of the environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme, the EIAR submitted as part of the application for development consent for the Proposed Scheme assesses the potential effects of the development on the environment. The EIAR chapters provide a robust impact assessment on the environmental factors in accordance with the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended (the 'EIA Directive'). Where significant effects have been identified</p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>within these EIAR Chapters – including in relation to air quality, human health, noise and vibration, biodiversity, landtake etc. – appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures have been developed to reduce the potential negative effects of the Proposed Scheme on the environment. The EIAR has been prepared in accordance with best practice guidelines on EIA, including Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) guidelines, as well as topic-specific guidelines as documented in each EIAR chapter.</p> <p>Similarly, the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) that was prepared and submitted with the application, to facilitate the Board in making the Appropriate Assessment Determination, assessed whether the Proposed Scheme, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site(s) in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives (CO) of the site(s). The NIS concluded that provided mitigation measures are implemented in full the Proposed Scheme, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites. The NIS, in conjunction with detailed information in the EIAR, specifically deals with effects on all hydrologically connected Special Areas of Conservation.</p> <p>It is noted that the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage state the following in their submission in the context of nature conservation with respect to the Proposed Scheme: <i>“Having considered the documentation supporting this road scheme application, and in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS), the Department is satisfied in general that the approaches set out in these documents with regards to both the design of the project and the adoption of measures to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on plants, animals and habitats during its construction and operation should result in the minimisation of such impacts to the extent that no significant negative effects should result to flora or fauna including Qualifying Interests (QIs) for local European sites from the scheme’s implementation as proposed. It is considered that if the measures set out in the EIAR and NIS to avoid and reduce possible adverse impacts on flora, fauna and habitats are diligently implemented in accordance with the methodologies proposed, any significant potential adverse effects on plants and animals can be avoided, including any effects on species which are QIs for the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Protection Area (SPA) which the road scheme is to traverse or for the downstream Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC and Boyne Estuary SPA.”</i></p> <p>In addition, an Environmental Operating Plan (EOP) prepared in accordance with the TII Guidelines for the Creation, Implementation and Maintenance of an Environmental Operating Plan as part of the overall mitigation strategy, has been included in the EIAR (Vol. 4B, Appendix 5.6). The EOP contains the mitigation and monitoring measures relevant to the contractor and these are included as an Appendix to the EOP. Meath County Council is responsible for the majority of the operational phase mitigation and monitoring.</p> <p>The contractor will take ownership of the EOP once appointed. EIAR Vol. 2 Chapter 5, Section 5.10 (Environmental Management During Construction) states that: <i>MCC will ensure that all mitigation and monitoring committed to in the EIAR and NIS and planning conditions, will be enforced on the</i></p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		contractor through express terms of the contract, and will be overseen by an official engaged by the Council.
3	<p><b>Community Access:</b> Public rights of way are essential for ensuring equitable access to the amenities of Slane. It cites in the plans for the proposed bypass and enhancement of the village that this will have a positive impact to the residents of Slane village but I do not think that the impact this proposed route and closure of public access will have on our property has been considered. In particular, with the closure of the road and extinguishment of public access, we will no longer be able to walk from our house to the N2 which is currently 200 meters and into the village of Slane. The proposed route forces us now to have to take a car wherever we want to go adding to the pollution in the area. Closing off these routes restricts mobility and diminishes the quality of life for residents of Fennor, particularly those without access to private transportation.</p>	Refer to the response to Item 2 above regarding the temporary closure of the L16002 (Rossnaree Road).
4	<p><b>Impact to Our Property:</b> The proposed bypass will have a negative impact on the market value of our property. The bypass will also impact the currently unobstructed view from our property and our quality of life. As noted above, our neighbours home will be subject to CPO as a result of the proposed bypass. We would like the following questions addressed; a. What will happen to the property which is currently on the land of Joseph Coen, Fennor, Slane, Co Meath? b. What boundaries and noise barriers are proposed for the same property and our property as a result of our property being the closest inhabited property to the bypass if the planning for the proposed bypass is approved?</p>	<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been provided in EIAR Chapter 12 (Landscape and Visual). As part of the LVIA an assessment of the potential impacts arising from the Proposed Scheme during both Construction Phase and Operational Phase on residential receptors within 300m of the Proposed Scheme has been included at Section 12.4.4. The findings from this assessment have identified that moderate to major Landscape and Visual impacts are predicted for this receptor during the operational phase of the project. Response to landowner's specific questions are as follows: a. The property will be retained. b. Section 9.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 9 identifies the mitigation measures, including proposed noise barriers, to mitigate noise impacts during the operational phase of the scheme. No further noise barriers are proposed in the scheme.</p>
5	<p><b>Alternative Solutions:</b> The proposal of the extinguishment of public access for the N2 bypass causes a great deal of inconvenience and financial impact to our lives when the simplest solution to all of this would be the removal of the current tolls for HGV on the M1. The root cause of the issue of HGV's through Slane is a direct result of the toll currently in place on the M1 at Drogheda and if this toll was not there, we believe the HGVs would not be using Slane as a means to circumvent the toll.</p>	<p>A comprehensive selection process has been carried out to identify the preferred option for this scheme. This is documented in the N2 Slane Option Selection Report as provided in Vol. 4B, Appendix 3.1 of the EIAR. Section 4.4 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report describes the approach taken to the assessment of Traffic Management Alternatives. Six different types of measures were considered – different ways of potentially achieving HGV traffic reduction in Slane Village and at Slane Bridge. 5. Measures involving legal prohibition of Heavy Goods Vehicles (as the vehicle type with the greatest individual significance to the human environment) at locations around Slane, including on the N2 at or near Slane Bridge. 6. Measures involving new barrier-free tolls at locations around Slane, including on the N2 at or near Slane Bridge.</p>



<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>7. Measures involving reduction or removal of existing motorway tolls so as to attract traffic away from Slane.</p> <p>8. Measures involving increases in journey time on the N2 to discourage traffic from choosing this route.</p> <p>9. Measures involving schemes to reduce journey times on the principal alternative routes.</p> <p>10. Measures involving attracting journeys away from the car altogether, to other modes of transport.</p> <p>A structured approach was taken to the identification and analysis of the various traffic management alternatives identified.</p> <p>Appendix M to Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report initially summarised the status of previous studies conducted. Section 1.3 of this document describes the various analyses carried out during the period 2012 and 2015 in relation to the assessment of traffic management alternatives.</p> <p>The objective of the measures considered is to provide traffic management measures to divert HGVs from Slane village. The studies assessed the effects of HGV toll measures including the scenario of removing the HGV toll on the M1, HGV ban measures and other traffic management options. The results of the various analyses confirm that measures can be implemented which could achieve a reduction in the number of HGVs in Slane. The studies also acknowledged that achieving this outcome would have additional negative effects in terms of transport efficiency particularly for regions served by the N2 National Route between Ashbourne and Co Monaghan and that other less desirable routes for HGV traffic would likely experience increases in HGV traffic. Furthermore, all the measures are likely to have poor returns in terms of value for money and that public acceptance for most proposals is likely to be low.</p> <p>The option selection process for the Scheme sought to build on the previous work carried out and to assess traffic management alternatives using the phased multi-criteria assessment approach described in EIAR Chapter 3.</p> <p>The details of the measures assessed are described in Sections 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report. Measures include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV ban options</li> <li>• Tolling options</li> <li>• Removal of toll options</li> <li>• N2 Route Disimprovements</li> <li>• Improvements to alternative routes</li> <li>• Improvements to alternative modes</li> </ul> <p>Section 6.3 of Appendix 3.1 Options Selection Report describes the Stage 1 appraisal process where the options are firstly sifted out where they offer little or no tangible benefit to Slane village and are clearly very poor value for money. The second stage consisted of a more detailed analysis, utilising output from the Traffic Model to assess the following in more detail;</p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
Item No.	Observation	Response
		<p>11. Predicted traffic relief in Slane                      12. Comparative impact on the wider road network                      13. Economy                      14. Financial</p> <p>The analysis is described in detail in Appendix 3.1, Section 6.3.                      The outcome of this initial analysis was the identification of the best performing options to be taken forward for Stage 2 Appraisal. These options were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative A1 - Slane &amp; Broadboyne bridges - ban all HCV as the best non-tolling option</li> <li>• Alternative A2 as A1 but also ban at N51 W of village as the TM option that gives most traffic relief to Slane village</li> <li>• Alternative A3 - HCV ban Broadboyne, toll on Slane bridge, reduce tolls M1 J9 as the measure which offers best value for money.</li> <li>• Alternative A4 – Remove HGV tolls on the M1 and M3 and ban 5+axle HGVs at Slane Bridge &amp; Broadboyne Bridge as an option that has least negative impact on the local road network.</li> </ul> <p>Section 7.3.3 of Appendix 3.1 describes the traffic impact of the traffic management alternatives in terms of their impact in Slane village, impact on the N2 corridor, impact on the M1 corridor and impact on the wider road network.</p> <p>The alternatives are shown to be capable of achieving significant reductions in the numbers of HGVs in Slane village (Table 7-21 refers). However, the overall impact on total traffic volumes is minimal (by removing HGV content, other traffic is attracted to the N2 corridor) and that peak hour congestion would continue to occur (Tables 7-18 to 7-20 refer). The overall traffic impact on the N2 corridor is the reduction in HGV content but the overall impact is small (Table 7-22 refers). Broadly, the impact on the M1 corridor is a corresponding increase in HGV traffic (Table 7-23 refers). The impact on the wider road network varies somewhat between the options, but the notable impact is the increase in HGV traffic on routes and in other villages between the N2 and M1 (Table 7-24). This is a highly undesirable effect to divert additional HGV traffic to routes/villages that are not considered suitable for the reassignment of this traffic from an existing national primary route.</p> <p>Section 7.3.3.5 of Appendix 3.1 describes the conclusions of Traffic Management Alternatives Traffic Assessment. It is acknowledged that the alternatives are capable of removing HGV traffic from Slane village but this benefit is out-weighed by other effects which do little further in terms of overall traffic volumes in the village leaving existing congestion unresolved. The road safety risk in Slane would not be resolved by the alternatives and the ‘bottle-neck’ effect on the N2 route would be retained. Crucially, additional road safety risk would be transferred to other parts of the road network, which are not suitable for such increase in risk.</p> <p>The analysis draws the following over-arching conclusion;                      The principal conclusion is that it is not an appropriate road management strategy to divert HGVs from a national primary road (albeit a poor standard section) onto lower standard less safe regional</p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>roads introducing new road safety risks. This is contrary to the proper management of the area wide road network.</p> <p>The proper course of action is to implement improvement to the sub-standard national primary route and for HGV traffic to be retained on the national primary route.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above assessment the traffic management alternatives were included within the multi-criteria assessment described in detail in Section 8 of Appendix 3.1.</p> <p>The Economic appraisal concludes that the traffic management alternatives rank as either poor or least preferred. Relatively low implementation costs are offset by little or no transport economic benefit.</p> <p>Clearly, the traffic management alternatives are overall preferred from the Environment appraisal as there would be no impact on land acquisition and construction at new locations. However, it is noted these options are ranked as least preferred under Air Quality, Traffic Impact and Noise and Vibration due to the limited effects in Slane village. Similarly Architectural Heritage and Non-agricultural properties score less well for the traffic management alternatives as there are reduced beneficial effects in Slane village.</p> <p>The Safety appraisal also ranks the traffic management alternatives as least preferred. This is primarily due to the road safety risks on the N2 in Slane are at best only partially addressed by these options.</p> <p>The discerning criteria under the Accessibility criterion is the extent to which options reduce traffic congestion and remove significant volumes of HCVs from Slane village to improve the ability of all of the communities in and around Slane village to access on foot the facilities, amenities and employment opportunities in Slane. Considering that the bypass options do not relieve all the traffic in Slane, traffic management alternative A2 (achieves best HGV reduction in the village) is assessed to be preferred along with each of the bypass options.</p> <p>The Integration criterion considers how well the proposed investment fits with other elements of Government transport and non-transport policy. Under this criteria, the traffic management alternatives score ranges from least preferred to intermediate.</p> <p>The Physical Activity criterion considers the benefit of a project to facilitating increased physical activity. The traffic management alternatives are assessed as least preferred under this heading.</p> <p>Section 9 of Appendix 3.1 documents in detail the preferred option selection decision process. In terms of the traffic management alternatives, the over-arching conclusion described in Section 9.2.3 is that each traffic management option is shown to be capable of reducing the number of HGVs in Slane, particularly on the N2. However, these options do not adequately address the problems in Slane as noted and combining this with the highly negative effect of transferring further road safety risk onto other unsuitable roads/villages lead to the overall conclusion that the appropriate course of action is to implement improvement to the sub-standard N2 national primary road.</p> <p>The analysis in Appendix 3.1 shows that this can realistically be only achieved by implementing a bypass solution.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	13	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Michelle and Kevin Garrigan	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
6	<p>We urge the relevant authorities to reconsider the decision of proposed extinguishment of public right of way. We urge the planners to look for an alternative route for this bypass which does not impact the family lives of people in the community of Slane and Fennor.</p> <p>We look forward to engaging with you on this matter in the future.</p>	<p>With regard to rights of ways, refer to the response to Item 2 above.</p> <p>With regards to the alternatives considered for the Proposed Scheme, refer to the response to Item 5 above.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	14	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Monica & William Connolly (CPO 121)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowners object to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed roundabout junction, the N2 Mainline, the N51 West Realignment, the N51 East Realignment with link to existing road, an attenuation pond, a maintenance access track and landowner access tracks.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway. The owners are concerned in relation to negative impacts on the drainage of the retained lands.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0004 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Where adjacent lands drain towards the road scheme, interceptor drainage is proposed alongside the earthworks to collect runoff and convey to a suitable outfall.</p> <p>It is noted that this matter is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p> <p>The dwelling within CPO Plot 121d.1 is proposed to be acquired and demolished as part of the Proposed Scheme and hence the noise impact has not been presented in the EIAR.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	14	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Monica & William Connolly (CPO 121)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
4	<p><b>Access – General</b>                  More detail is required in relation to the access provision to the retained lands. Insufficient information has been provided in relation to the surfacing and so on of the access road. There is a lack of clarity in relation to the ownership of the access road and in addition the boundary treatment of the access road for this landowner and the neighbouring landowner is unclear. There are two access roads running side by side and the boundary between the two roads has not been clarified.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.                  Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Access Track 3A is proposed to provide access to the retained lands.                  As per Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4, access tracks will be constructed as per TII CC-SCD-00706 and will generally have a pavement width of 4.0 m with 1.0 m wide grassed verges. The access tracks will be surfaced with a bituminous double surface dressing.                  The fencing design proposed to define the boundary between the adjacent access tracks is illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C- FE0005 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Timber post and tension mesh fencing, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00321, is proposed.                  Subject to the approval by ABP, the lands proposed to be permanently acquired by MCC are identified in the CPO schedule and deposit maps.                  Construction of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states that “Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and divided lands will, where practicable, be maintained by the contractor during construction of the Proposed Scheme; otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided to and from divided land plots and to and from the public road network.”                  Access to lands following completion of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states, “Permanent access will be provided to all divided lands. Where required this access will be to and from the public road network and where appropriate the access will be by way of farm tracks and overbridges”.</p>
5	<p><b>Access Restriction at Shed</b>                  The new road fence is very close to an existing building such that the space between the building and the fence of the road appears to be inadequate in relation to access.</p>	<p>The distance between the fence and nearest edge of the building is a minimum of approximately 6 metres. It is considered that this is an adequate distance to not impede access.</p>
6	<p><b>Screening and Planting</b>                  We object to the inadequate screening and planting being proposed.</p>	<p>Figure 12.7(c) of EIAR Chapter 12 identifies the Specific Landscape Mitigation associated with the portion of the Proposed Scheme impacting on CPO 121. Table 12-38 of EIAR Chapter 12 identifies the mitigation measures proposed which include new hedgerow planting along the scheme boundary and a variety of landscape treatments, including woodland planting to integrate and screen the Proposed Scheme within the existing landscape.                  EIAR Section 12.6 describes the residual visual impact of the Proposed Scheme post establishment of the proposed mitigation measures.</p>
7	<p><b>Lighting</b>                  Insufficient detail has been provided in the EIAR regarding the artificial lighting proposals along the new road.</p>	<p>Road lighting proposals for the scheme are described in Section 4.4.14.4 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	14	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Monica & William Connolly (CPO 121)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
8	<p><b>Legal, Design and Planning Matters</b> Such other legal, design and planning matters as may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted
9	<p><b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted
10	<p>The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted. An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	15	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Patricia Farrell (CPO 122)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed N51 East Realignment, with link to existing road, and landowner access tracks.</p>
2	<p><b>Drainage</b> Inadequate drainage details have been provided along the proposed new roadway such as the realignment of existing drains that may be severed by the proposed new road and the concern about adverse drainage problems to the retained lands during and after the construction of the new road.</p>	<p>Description of the scheme's drainage design is provided in Section 4.4.11 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The drainage design proposals in this area are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-DR0004 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>It is noted that the matter of drainage is also addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties), where it states that "All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the pre-construction (ground surveys and investigations) and construction works will be confirmed during discussions with landowners. Land drains will, to the extent possible, be maintained during the course of the works. Any damage to drains due to the works will be repaired on completion of the works. MCC as the developing authority will seek to minimise the damage involved and, to the extent required by law, will pay compensation to the owner or occupier. Any such claim for compensation will be dealt with expeditiously."</p>
3	<p><b>Noise</b> Inadequate information has been provided regarding the mitigation measures that are being proposed to control noise pollution.</p>	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>
4	<p><b>Access - General</b> We object to the lack of detail on access to the retained property.</p>	<p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO0002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Access Track 1 is proposed to provide access to the retained lands on southern side of realigned N51 East. Existing field entrance is to be retained for access from existing N51 to lands retained on northern side of realigned N51 East.</p>



<b>No.:</b>	15	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Patricia Farrell (CPO 122)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Access to lands during construction of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found in Section 20.5.1 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states that "Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and divided lands will, where practicable, be maintained by the contractor during construction of the Proposed Scheme; otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided to and from divided land plots and to and from the public road network."</p> <p>Access to lands following completion of the scheme is addressed by the mitigation measures found Section 20.5.2 of EIAR Chapter 20, where it states, "Permanent access will be provided to all divided lands. Where required this access will be to and from the public road network and where appropriate the access will be by way of farm tracks and overbridges".</p>
5	<p><b>Access Road Details</b>                  Insufficient information has been supplied regarding the proposed accommodation road.</p>	<p>As per Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4, access tracks will be constructed as per TII CC-SCD-00706 and will generally have a pavement width of 4.0 m with 1.0 m wide grassed verges. The access tracks will be surfaced with a bituminous double surface dressing.</p> <p>The fencing design alongside Access Track 1 is illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C- FE0005 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Timber post and tension mesh fencing, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00321, is proposed along the road boundary. Timber post and rail fencing, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00301, is proposed to define the boundary between the adjacent access tracks.</p> <p>The geometric design for Access Track 1 is illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-GE3002 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR.</p>
6	<p><b>Other Matters</b>                  Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted.
7	Our client's primary concern is in relation to the impacts on their property rather than the overall proposed scheme itself.	Noted.
8	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>

<b>No.:</b>	16	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Paul Loughran (CPO 109)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p><b>Surplus Land Acquisition</b> The landowner objects to the acquisition of lands. which appear to be surplus for the scheme requirements .</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed N2 Mainline.</p>
2	<p><b>Noise</b> In relation to noise mitigation, my client does not believe that the clay bund that is being constructed along the western side of his property is appropriate. The road is in cut and therefore the noise should be trapped within the cutting.</p>	<p>A clay bund is not proposed along the western side of this landowner's property.</p> <p>EIAR Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment during both the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>Sections 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 provide details on construction noise and construction traffic noise criteria, respectively. Section 9.2.4.5 provides details on operational noise design goal and mitigation criteria.</p> <p>The likely significant effects are assessed in Section 9.4 with the construction phase assessed in Section 9.4.1 and the operational phase assessed in Section 9.4.2.</p> <p>Section 9.5 identifies the mitigation measures to mitigate both noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase (Section 9.5.1) and the operational phase (Section 9.5.2).</p>
3	<p><b>Boundary Treatment and Screening</b> There is a lack of clarity at this point in time in relation to the boundary treatment particularly in relation to a hedge and also the details of the fence.</p>	<p>Boundary treatment proposals for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.2 of EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>Timber post and tension mesh fence, as per TII standard detail CC-SCD-00321, is proposed along the scheme boundary at this location.</p> <p>Figure 12.7(b) of EIAR Chapter 12 identifies the Specific Landscape Mitigation associated with the portion of the Proposed Scheme impacting on CPO 109. Table 12-38 of EIAR Chapter 12 identifies the mitigation measures proposed which include new hedgerow planting along the scheme boundary and a minimum 4 m depth of mixed species woodland planting, with evergreen species, to top of cutting. Woodland planting to be extended down slopes to provide screening of deep cuttings and provide visual integration with the wider landscape.</p>
4	<p><b>Other Matters</b> Such other relevant matters that may arise when more detailed design information is made available.</p>	Noted.
5	My client's primary concern is in relation to the impacts on their property rather than the overall proposed scheme itself.	Noted.
6	The information supplied by the Acquiring Authority is incomplete and may change. We reserve the right to include other grounds of objection and to elaborate on the above listed	Noted.

<b>No.:</b>	16	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Paul Loughran (CPO 109)	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Response</b>
	grounds of objection when further information is made available to us by the Acquiring Authority and to tender these at the An Bord Pleanála Hearing. We request that an Oral Hearing be held in relation to the scheme.	An Bord Pleanála may, in its absolute discretion, hold an oral hearing in relation to the Proposed Scheme.

<b>No.:</b>	17	
<b>Name of Submitter:</b>	Susan Traill (CPO 201)	
Item No.	Observation	Response
1	<p>We act on behalf of the land owner who is being adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of Plots 201, A, B, C, D, E and F. We are therefore instructed on behalf of our client to object to this Scheme in general and specifically as enough and sufficient information has not been provided by the acquiring authority and the proposal as outlined has a huge detrimental effect on our client's holding at Slane.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to make a submission in relation the N2 Slane Bypass and Public Realm Enhancement Scheme (the 'Proposed Scheme').</p> <p>The proposed land acquisition does not exceed what is necessary for the delivery of this scheme and the land acquisition is a proportionate response to the public need and common good on the one hand and seeking to limit the acquisition of land from the landowners on the other and at the same time seeking to protect the environment.</p> <p>Lands are to be acquired from this landowner to allow construction of proposed car park for Slane Village and active travel link from car park to existing N2 south of the village centre, both of which are important parts of the Slane Public Realm Enhancement design.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the scheme's landtake on agricultural properties is described in 20.4.2.5 of EIAR Chapter 22 (Material Assets: Agricultural Properties). The results of this assessment recognise that the pre-mitigation impact of the scheme's landtake on this property (CPO 201a, 201b and 201c) is moderate and the residual impact remains moderate with mitigation measures implemented.</p> <p>Access measures for lands impacted by the scheme are described in Section 4.4.15.2.1 of EIAR Chapter 4.</p> <p>Access proposals for this property are illustrated on drawing number MDT0806-RPS-01-N2-DR-C-LO9201 contained in Volume 3 of the EIAR. The access provisions for this landowner include a replacement entrance onto the N51 and a crossing of the proposed active travel link to provide access between severed lands.</p> <p>The landowners will be entitled to claim for compensation arising out of the CPO and any associated injurious affection arising out of the use of the land acquired from this landowner by the Council which will be subject of a separate process.</p>