



## 8. STRATEGIC OPTIONS

---

*Three strategic options, one for the containment of future growth within the Metropolitan Area, one for the major expansion of Dublin and the north-east part of the Greater Dublin Area, building on the emerging Dublin-Belfast Economic Corridor, and one focusing growth on major towns in the Hinterland Area, were developed in detail.*

*Any one of the options outlined can accommodate the scale of expected growth in the future and they provide a basis for the proposed strategy, outlined in Chapter 10.*

---

### PURPOSE OF OPTIONS

The options are a development of the strategic models. Each one combines some features of the models and extends them into a more complete alternative. With the options, population distributions have been considered and targets set so that the implications of each option for particular local authority areas can be readily identified. As with the models, each strategic option has been assessed against the set of criteria. (outlined in Chapter 6)

### OPTION 1: CONTAINMENT

This option seeks to confine the larger proportion of future development within an area that is relatively close to the existing built-up area of Dublin, extending from Balbriggan in the north through the Maynooth-Kilcock area in the west to Greystones in the south. It broadly corresponds to the Metropolitan Area, with an extension of the area to the north as far as Balbriggan (see Map 14 - Option 1).

The Containment Model incorporates much of the Continuation of Existing Trends Model as it applies to the eastern part of the Greater Dublin Area, and also contains some elements of the Compact City Model.

Residential development would be distributed broadly in accordance with the distribution of zoned lands within the containment area. A smaller proportion of future growth would be allocated to the remaining areas to provide for local needs. An indicative distribution of future population is given in Table 8.1.

Dublin city centre would remain the largest employment centre. Other major employment centres would be in the Swords/Dublin Airport area, in Blanchardstown-Mulhuddart, Lucan/Clondalkin and Leixlip/Maynooth, and in other established and proposed industrial estates in the suburbs such as in Sandymount and Bray.

The existing major retail centres, including the city centre would be supplemented by additional provision. This could be accommodated by the provision of new and expanded supermarkets (of not more than 3,000 square metres floorspace) spread throughout the development area, together with the further development of comparison shopping in the city centre and at established locations such as Tallaght, Blanchardstown, etc.

The implementation of schemes currently in planning or projected by the local authorities would meet the wastewater treatment requirements. In addition, measures to improve the sewerage infrastructure and to augment water supplies would be required.



Although the option would result in an overall reduction in the need to travel, through the concentration of activity, transportation difficulties would remain unless there was a significant increase in public transportation investment and usage.

## OPTION 2: DUBLIN AND THE NORTH-EAST

This option recognises both the economic attractions of the north-eastern part of the Greater Dublin Area (especially Dublin Airport and access to Dublin Port via the tunnel) and the relative availability of suitable land for development. It also builds on the developing Dublin-Belfast economic corridor (see Map 15 - Option 2).

Within the north-east quadrant, the model seeks to concentrate future development in specific 'poles' and to make best use of capacity in existing and planned wastewater treatment facilities and available zoned lands.

The option builds on the Transportation Corridors - Satellite Town Model, but also incorporates the further development of the three western towns of Tallaght, Lucan/Clondalkin and Blanchardstown and some further concentration of population into the Dublin City area. Elements of the Economic Corridors, Transportation Corridors - Smaller Centres and Outer Catchments Models are also incorporated.

In this option residential development is concentrated into the 'identified development poles', with only a small proportion of future growth allocated to the remaining areas to accommodate local needs. An indicative distribution of future population is given in Table 8.2.

Table 8.2 Indicative Distribution of Future Population - Option 2

	Pop. 1996	Pop. 2011	% Increase	H'holds 2011	% Increase
Dublin County Borough	481,854	527,000	9	219,000	21
Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown	189,999	205,000	8	82,000	25
Fingal	167,683	263,000	57	105,000	55
Kildare	134,992	147,000	9	56,000	31
Meath	109,732	141,000	29	54,000	41
South Dublin	218,728	244,000	12	98,000	37
Wicklow	102,683	123,000	20	47,000	34
Total	1,405,671	1,650,000	17	661,000	33

The existing employment centres in the Blanchardstown-Mulhuddart and Swords/Dublin Airport areas would experience significant development. A major employment centre would be developed in Navan along with smaller development centres in Balbriggan and in the East Meath area. There would also be further development of other employment centres, including Dublin city centre. Major retailing, supplementing the existing provision, could be developed at the major centres, especially in Navan and in Balbriggan.

The implementation of currently planned and projected schemes by the local authorities would meet a significant part of the wastewater treatment requirements. In addition, measures to improve the sewerage infrastructure and to augment water supplies would be required.

The option would require improved links between the 'development poles' and Dublin, using the identified transportation corridors. The implementation of all existing

proposals to improve transportation infrastructure within the existing built-up area, together with some additional measures, such as a possible rail link from Dublin to Navan, improved road links from Navan to the M1, the extension of the currently proposed rail upgrading from Maynooth to Kilcock and an additional rail route through the city centre.



This option has a number of advantages. It builds on existing major economic infrastructure in areas with a high attractiveness for employment generating activities. It utilises existing transportation corridors and has the potential to reduce the need to travel. Economic activities would also be spread away from the built up area of Dublin.

The principal disadvantage of this option is that there would be little development potential for the south east of the Greater Dublin Area.

This option provides a number of benefits over Option 1, but at increased cost, especially in terms of public transportation. It also produces a clearer, more coherent development pattern.

### OPTION 3: WESTERN SATELLITE TOWNS

This option seeks to create relatively independent towns in the Hinterland Area, located at a distance from Dublin that would be sufficient to inhibit their use only as dormitory centres. Each settlement would require to develop a significant employment base together with the provision of a high level of services.

Navan and Naas-Newbridge-Kilcullen are identified as major development centres. It is also proposed to develop Kildare-Monasterevin and Athy. Both these latter settlements would obtain water from, and drain to, the Barrow Catchment. Athy is not located on a transportation corridor, but is on a railway line. However, road access would require improvement (see Map 16 - Option 3).

The option builds on the transportation corridors and is, therefore, very similar to the Transportation Corridors - Satellite Towns Model, but also includes elements of the New Town and Outer Catchments Models.

Residential development would be concentrated into the identified centres. A significant proportion of future growth would be allocated to areas outside the proposed centres to provide for local needs, particularly in the existing Dublin area. An indicative distribution of future population is given in Table 8.3.

**Table 8.3 Indicative Distribution of Future Population - Option 3**

	Pop. 1996	Pop. 2011	% Increase	H'holds 2011	% Increase
Dublin County Borough	481,854	527,000	9	219,000	21
Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown	189,999	205,000	8	82,000	25
Fingal	167,683	228,000	36	91,000	48
Kildare	134,992	169,000	26	65,000	40
Meath	109,732	153,000	40	59,000	46
South Dublin	218,728	248,000	13	99,000	38
Wicklow	102,683	120,000	17	46,000	32
Total	1,405,671	1,650,000	17	661,000	33

Future large-scale employment centres would include Naas-Newbridge-Kilcullen. Major new employment activities would also be developed at Navan, Kildare-Monasterevin and Athy. Some further development of other employment areas, including Dublin city centre, would also be envisaged.

In addition to schemes already planned, the option would require new and/or upgraded wastewater treatment facilities at Kildare-Monasterevin and Athy. Most of the other schemes planned for the Greater Dublin Area would also require implementation, but some may be reduced in size. In addition, measures to improve the sewerage infrastructure and to augment water supplies would be required.

The option would require improved links between the centres and Dublin, using the identified transportation corridors. The implementation of all existing proposals to improve transportation infrastructure within the existing built-up area, together with some additional measures, would also be required. These additional measures would include the upgrading of the Athy-Kildare-Dublin rail link, as well as a possible rail link from Dublin to Navan, improved road links from Navan to the M1, an outer strategic road linking the centres, the extension of the currently proposed rail upgrading from Maynooth to Kilcock and possibly another rail route through the city centre. This option has a number of advantages, including a significant regional spread of development away from the existing built-up area which would in turn help reduce urban sprawl. It facilitates public transport and has the potential to reduce the overall need to travel, but only if each of the development centres were to achieve a significant employment base sufficient to reduce the need for large-scale commuting to the Dublin area. Otherwise, significant traffic problems arising from commuting would occur. The option also provides a clear, coherent strategy for the Greater Dublin Area.

Due to the fact that significant additional infrastructure would be required this option is more costly than Options 1 or 2.



## SUMMARY APPRAISAL

The relative performance of each option, as assessed against the criteria outlined in Chapter 6, is summarised in Table 8.4.

Any one of the options outlined can accommodate the scale of expected growth in the future and there is merit in each of them. The attractiveness of the north-east quadrant for economic activity, with its established and developing infrastructure, is clear and this area is likely to develop significantly in the future, unless there are major interventions to restrict growth there. The containment option best meets the requirements of sustainable development, providing the conditions for the growth and development of a much-enhanced public transport system and reducing the need to travel. The development of the western satellite towns, on the other hand, would provide growth opportunities alternative to the existing built-up area and reduce pressure on that area.

Table 8.4 Summary Appraisal of Strategic Options

	Containment	Dublin and the North East	Western Satellite Towns
Facilitation of public transport	Excellent	Good	Good
Balance of public and private transport	Fair	Good	Good
Reduction in the need to travel			
-Employment	Good	Good	Good
-Shopping and social facilities	Good	Good	Fair
Utilisation of existing capacity			
-Zoned lands	Good	Fair	Fair
-Sanitary services	Good	Good	Fair
-Transport	Good	Fair	Poor
Use of under-utilised land			
-Brownfield site	Excellent	Excellent	Good
-Low density residential areas	Good	Fair	Poor
Facilitation of economic activities	Excellent	Excellent	Good
Facilitation of higher residential densities	Good	Good	Fair
Facilitation of mixed uses	Good	Good	Fair
Equity and affordability			
-Integration	Fair	Fair	Fair
-Affordability	Fair	Fair	Good
Supports urban/rural demarcation	Excellent	Good	Good
Conservation of high quality agricultural land	Excellent	Good	Good
Protection of heritage and amenity	Good	Good	Good
Contributes to regional balance	Poor	Fair	Good
Relatively low cost	Good	Fair	Poor

## COMMON REQUIREMENTS

In considering options for the future development of the Greater Dublin Area, it emerges that there is a significant set of common infrastructural requirements, necessary regardless of the option pursued. These cover both sanitary services and transportation infrastructure and are required to meet existing needs, national priorities and common requirements. They include many projects that are currently committed and/or at planning stage.