

## Submission by a Windsor Road Resident

I welcome the proposed improvement of Dublin's public transport. But, from the points of view both of citywide strategy and of local impact in the Rathmines-Ranelagh area, I see serious shortcomings in the Metrolink proposal as published.

As regards citywide strategy, New Metro North is welcome, but the current public consultation unconvincingly tags on to NMN the Luas Green Line Tie-In Study (LGLTS); without referring -- either in the 'Public Consultation 2018' document or in the LGLTS --to other possible LUAS or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) such as the BRT1 (from UCD to Christchurch and beyond) and BRT 2 (from Rathfarnham to Christchurch etc.), as outlined in An Taisce's March 2015 Submission on Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area. Additional LUAS lines or BRT could relieve pressure on the LUAS Green Line, while benefitting other parts of the city. Metrolink ought to be considered in the context of the next 100 years; and (at least in this Public Consultation) I don't see that this has been done.

As regards the impacts in Rathmines-Ranelagh, these would be more positive if the proposals considered permeability, foot traffic and urban design to a much greater extent. It seems unrealistic to close Dunville Avenue to vehicle traffic, consequently diverting east-west vehicle traffic to the already overloaded Rathmines-Ranelagh Charleston Road north of the area, and to Milltown Road on the Dodder, south of the area. I see no analysis of this in terms of vehicle, cycle or foot traffic, less still of the impact on schools, churches, businesses etc. which are key amenities of this area. The closure of the footpath across the W.M on Albany Road at the Church seems to compound this shortcoming.

And at this local level, the "Quietway" proposed for walking and cycle traffic appears to have been disregarded, accentuating the sense that plans are disjointed. As regards my public transport, I heard at the public session in the Hilton Hotel that the Green Line will not operate for about a year while the "Tie-In" is built. If that is so, it ought to have been explained in the Public Consultation documents. Likewise the costs and benefits of the preferred and alternative strategy/design ought to have been analysed and quantified, instead of being deferred until after the Public Consultation, although I am glad to see that a second round of such consultations is planned. The current process is too rushed, and based on a design proposal which begs too many questions.