

Appendix 1

There were over 400 questionnaires returned and the results are summarised in Table A1.1.

| Table A1.1 Results of Questionnaire | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------|------|---------------|
| | Question | Yes % | No % | NO Response % |
| 1 | New housing developments should be located in higher density locations accessible to existing cities, towns and suburban centres and to public transport | 66 | 28 | 6 |
| 2 | A clearer division should be maintained between city / town and rural areas to prevent 'creeping' development | 91 | 7 | 2 |
| 3 | Housing units types and sizes in the same area should be mixed to promote more balanced community profiles | 86 | 10 | 4 |
| 4 | Public transport should be favoured over the private car | 75 | 22 | 3 |
| 5 | Employment opportunities should be provided in conjunction with residential development to reduce work-related travel and private car usage | 92 | 5 | 3 |
| 6 | Shopping and social facilities be provided adjacent to residential areas to reduce private car usage | 80 | 17 | 3 |
| 7 | High quality agricultural land should be conserved for amenity value and productivity | 92 | 5 | 3 |
| 8 | Heritage and amenity locations should be protected by strong environmental policies | 98 | 1 | 1 |

As can be seen from the table above there were a number of questions which were not contentious at all. Questions 2, 5, 7 and 8 all received an over 90% positive response. Surprisingly question 6 which related to providing shopping facilities near residential areas received only a 80% positive response, while question 5 which related to the provision of employment close to residential areas received over 90% positive response.

A greater divide was evident in the questions relating to density (question 1), public transport (question 4) and mix of house type (question 3). Only 66% of those who responded were in favour of higher density while only 75% favoured public transport over the private car.

COMMENTS

The respondents were given the option to add additional comments to the completed questionnaire. The comments received can be divided into a number of categories:

1. Transport
2. Administration / Policy
3. Zoning
4. Amenity / Open Space
5. Strategy
6. Housing - including density

Transport

It was evident from the comments that improvements in the public transport infrastructure is required as a priority. A number of infrastructural projects were also identified as being necessary e.g. LUAS, rail links to Navan and Dublin Airport, orbital public transport routes. There was some conflict on the issue of locating development on public transport corridors - some were of the opinion that all new development should be exclusively on public transport routes while others felt that this was too simplistic an option and that development along public transport routes would disadvantage other areas.

Administration / Policy

A number of the comments related to the administration and implementation of the Guidelines. It was suggested that zoning should be the responsibility of a metropolitan planning authority. In relation to Development Plans it was suggested that existing / new development plans should be frozen pending a major review of recent re-zonings. Interventions in the existing / new development plans was advocated to stop creeping development in counties adjoining Dublin.

Amenity / Open Space

Overall there was support for maintaining the existing amenity areas. A number of comments related to the issue of greenbelts and it was suggested that greenbelts should be used for both passive and active recreation and should not be just left as under-utilised land.

Zoning

Comments relating to zoning indicated a preference for developing existing zoned land before re-zoning elsewhere. It was also suggested that the Guidelines should intervene in the re-zonings that have occurred in some of the counties during the development plan review process.

Strategy

A number of comments related to possible development strategies, some of which are similar to the options and alternatives identified by the consultants.

- 1) New Town Option - the possibility of developing a new town on a rail link was suggested
- 2) Decentralisation - building up existing towns outside the Greater Dublin Area was put forward. These towns would have employment opportunities which would prevent commuting to Dublin.

There was also support for the creation of a 'stop line' around Dublin with additional growth accommodated in outlying satellite towns. It was felt that such a stop line would save agricultural land from urban sprawl. Support was also given to the idea of first developing brownfield sites, especially in Dublin City, before re-zoning land elsewhere.

Housing - including density

The issue of higher density raised diverging opinions. Higher density, especially along public transport routes and in city centre areas was favoured by some. Other comments suggested that residential areas should be 'protected' from higher density. There was support for the construction of apartment blocks, especially high quality developments which could accommodate families. In relation to new housing developments it was felt that there should be a mix of house types and that community and social facilities should be provided.