



**NOTIFICATION TO ATTEND MEETING OF THE PLANNING, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
AND PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT SPC**

**TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, DAME STREET, DUBLIN 2.,**

**ON TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2016 AT 3.30 PM**

**AGENDA**

**TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2016**

		<b>PAGE</b>
1	Agenda Reports Pack	<b>1 - 18</b>
2	Minutes of meeting of 26th April 2016	
3	Matters arising	
4	Housing Task Force	
5	dublinbikes: Subscription Payment Options Evaluation	
6	Timelines in Planning	
7	International Relations	
8	A.O.B	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Strategic Policy Committee**  
**Planning, International Relations and Property Development**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 Council Chamber, City Hall**

**Attendance**

Cllr. Andrew Montague (chair)  
Cllr. Kieran Binchy  
Cllr. Janice Boylan  
Cllr. Áine Clancy  
Cllr. Patrick Costello  
Cllr. Dermot Lacey  
Cllr. Éilis Ryan

Mr. Patrick King  
Ms. Valerin O'Shea  
Ms. Oznur Yucel-Finn

Cllr. Mannix Flynn

**Apologies**

Mr. John McGrane

**Officials**

Mr. Jim Keogan, Assistant Chief Executive  
Mr. John O' Hara, A/City Planner  
Mr. Paul Clegg, Executive Manager, Planning & Property Development  
Mr. Peter Finnegan, Executive Manager, Economy & International Relations  
Ms. Niamh Lambert, Administrative Officer  
Mr. Michael Rossiter, Executive Planner  
Ms. Joy Watts, Staff Officer

**1. Minutes of Meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

**Order: Agreed**

**2. Matters Arising**

**Promoting Dublin as a City of Romance** (Motion from V.O'Shea at 3/11/15 SPC meeting) - Peter Finnegan will have a report by the next SPC. It will need agreement from the Arts, Culture, Leisure and Community SPC and the support of that SPC and in particular Fáilte Ireland to establish agreement re branding.

**Item 6: Motion 1320 – Erecting columbarium walls in some of our older cemeteries**

No reply has been received from the Arts, Culture, Leisure and Community SPC - to follow up.

**3. Active Land Management**

Discussion took place on the report that was circulated.

In relation to the questions raised and in particular to the queries on Oscar Traynor Road lands the Assistant Chief Executive stated that two reports had already been brought to the joint Planning and Housing SPCs and subsequently to the full City Council meeting for consideration. The current position regarding Oscar Traynor Road lands is that a brief is being developed for the lands and a more detailed feasibility study is being prepared for both the O'Devaney Gardens

site and St. Michael's estate lands. When these are finalised it will be brought to a further meeting of the joint SPC's by the end of May.

The Department of the Environment and Local Government provide conservation grants which are administered by the City Council. There is a ceiling on these grants and some of this funding is ring-fenced to target protected structures considered to be at risk. We have a *Buildings at Risk Register* and we work with owners to limit the risk to endangered buildings.

On the issue of density and acreage, density varies between inner city sites with accessible public transport, and sites in suburban areas.

Each Council has to implement the Vacant Land Levy. Dublin City Council will introduce the levy and to facilitate same it will be a requirement to provide an objective in the City Development Plan which will identify the areas in need of regeneration and housing and where the actual levy will apply. The Planning Department are awaiting guidelines from the DOE but have already commenced the process of surveying inner city sites under our Vacant Sites Study and it is hoped to have these sites mapped within the next few months. When completed the survey of sites will be extended to the entire City area. A levy equivalent to 3% of the land valuation can be introduced. However all land owners have the right of appeal.

A review of housing densities, *Planning and Development of Large-Scale, Rail Focussed Residential Areas in Dublin*, was undertaken in 2013 by the National Transport Authority, in conjunction with the Department of Environment and Local Government and the four Dublin Local Authorities. As agreed at the meeting this report will be circulated to the members for their information.

The Chair requested that a detailed report on the work of the Housing Task Force set up under Construction 2020 be brought to the next meeting of the SPC.

**Order: Noted and Agreed**

#### **4. dublinbikes Funding Options**

The report was discussed. The success of the Scheme was noted and expansion generally welcomed. A number of issues were noted including the need to ensure the scheme was accessible to those who don't have credit cards. Members of the SPC were reluctant to raise membership fees unless there was some recognition for those who were unemployed and students. It was considered that visitor fees could be raised but it was felt that information relating to short term membership needs to be improved on the website and elsewhere. There was a general consensus that while advertising may be problematical there was an acceptance that it was the only reasonable and viable option in securing separate capital current income to pay for the substantial cost in operating the full Scheme. It is noted that the NTA assisted with the capital funding of the Scheme and it is intended to continue to negotiate with them to seek assistance with operational funding.

The Chair requested a report be prepared for the next meeting outlining what options are available for people who don't have credit cards, so that there is universal access for all to the Scheme.

**Order: Noted.**

#### **5. UK Planning Exemptions**

The report was discussed and the differences between the UK and Ireland were outlined by John O'Hara.

Chair requested a report on the timelines in planning, showing all the stages and blockages highlighting where there are delays.

**Order: Noted.**

#### **6. Enforcement Procedure**

This report was produced for information purposes. Short discussion took place on unauthorised development and the need for immediate implementation of enforcement.

**Order: Noted**

## 7. International Relations

Some of the things the office has been doing to support the presence of Dublin by participation at various events:

Cllr Daithí Doolan deputised for the Lord Mayor at the *European Capital Cities Mayors Summit* in Amsterdam which had an urban agenda focussing particularly around housing issues;

By agreement of the Lord Mayor, Cllr Ciaran Cuffe is currently attending the *Global Mayors Innovation Conference* in Beijing. This is a Smart Cities initiative, but the real objective in attending, at the request of the Embassy in China and the IDA, is to bring that Conference with 3,000 participants to Dublin next year;

Visit from the Mayor of Guadalajara which led into the Sister Cities Summit (copy of the programme circulated);

Currently working on supporting the *Innovation 2.0 Conference* with Intel and the European Commission in Amsterdam, under the Dutch Presidency, in May;

Supporting the Lord Mayor and Fáilte Ireland's visit in May to Washington and New York, promoting Dublin as a destination for conferences;

The Mayor of Montreal arrives in Dublin on Friday and they are keen to foster closer relationships. We are not in a position to sign anything formal, but welcome their interest in the City;

Programme of Events for the Sister Cities Summit and President Higgins speech were circulated, and the opening video shown to the members. There were 350 participants in the Summit, including 49 in the delegation from San Jose.

Cllr Lacey congratulated Peter Finnegan and the staff of both International Relation section and the Mansion House, acknowledging all their involvement in the Summit's success. Cllr Boylan echoed these comments.

## 8. A.O.B:

**Next meeting:** Scheduled for 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 @ 3.30 in the Council Chamber, City Hall.

**Circulation date** for the Manager's Report on the Development Plan Motions is 16<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

## **Report to the Planning, International Relations & Property Development Strategic Policy Committee**

**June 2016**

### **Housing Task Force**

In May 2014, the Government published Construction 2020 – A Strategy for a Renewed Construction Sector. This strategy sets out Government policy to increase the capacity of the Sector to create and sustain jobs to a sustainable level consistent with the demands of a modern economy.

Action 2 of the Strategy commits to the establishment of a *Housing Supply Coordination Taskforce for Dublin with an immediate focus on addressing supply-related issues. It will work closely with industry and other parties, including those responsible for key infrastructure such as schools, to identify and address any obstacles to viable and appropriate development.*

The Housing Taskforce is co-ordinated by Department of Housing Planning and Local Government and it has participation from the following:

The four Dublin Local Authorities  
NAMA  
Department of Finance  
NTA  
The Housing Agency

In the context of measuring short term viable supply, the four Dublin local authorities and NAMA review all planning applications for 20 units or more and categorises them as follows:

#### Tier 1 sites:

This relates to sites where planning permission has been granted and the permission can be implemented immediately. Tier 1 sites include developments that have commenced and are currently under construction, and in some cases may include developments which contain completed units.

#### Tier 2(a)

Sites where a planning application has been lodged with a planning authority, and a final decision on that application is pending, are recorded as Tier 2(a) sites.

Tier 2(b)

This relates to lands which are zoned and where there is an appropriate planning policy in place or being put in place, and that there is no insurmountable infrastructure constraint which cannot be resolved.

The Housing Task Force has produced three reports to date on housing demand and supply in the Dublin Region. The third report (June 2016) contains an analysis of planning activity, housing affordability and delivery capacity considerations and is attached for your information.

**Jim Keogan**

**Assistant Chief Executive**



# CONSTRUCTION 2020

Housing Supply Coordination Taskforce for Dublin

Third Report – June 2016



Comhshaol, Pobal agus Rialtas Áitiúil  
Environment, Community and Local Government





## Introduction

In the twelve month period since the last report of the taskforce there has been significant public commentary from all sides of the housing debate. Much of the debate has centred on central bank rules, availability of construction finance, the economic viability of housing construction, rent controls, the planning system and speculation about the associated government response. While progress has been made there remains a critical disparity between demand and supply most notably evident in the level of homelessness recorded at 5811 in February 2016. Demand continues to outstrip supply particularly in Dublin where 2891 completions in 2015 represented a 12% year on year reduction. On a more positive note planning data as outlined below suggests activity levels are on the increase. Commencements in 2015 increased by 4.9% nationally but 24.2% in Dublin albeit from a low base. There is a considerable issue with the multiplicity of data sources which inform commentary and the taskforce would strongly recommend an enhanced role mandated to the Housing agency in the collection and collation of defined data to support housing policy which would have a creditable independence. The data collection should be assisted by the local authorities.

## Planning Activity

Despite the publication of live planning permission statistics by the taskforce in its first report this has on occasion being ignored in favour of an argument that the planning system may be a contributing factor to the housing crisis. In that June 2014 report the taskforce identified existing permissions for 25,906 housing units with the immediate prospect of a further 20,000 units on unconstrained zoned land if planning was sought. The group has revisited those figures at the end of QTR 4 2015. There are now 34,043 permitted units due to the increase in planning permissions in the interim period. In addition applications in the system with the local authorities or with An Bord Pleanala account for a further 6912 units. A more detailed analysis of unconstrained lands and the completion of SDZ reviews now reflects the potential for 47,949 units were they to be applied for. The following should be borne in mind when comparing the significant increase in Tier 2 potential from that estimated in the first report of the taskforce

- The 2014 data was for sites with 20 or more residential units. This was changed in spring 2015 to include data for sites with 10 or more residential units which has resulted in an increase in the number of Tier 1 units across all 4 Local Authorities.
- Originally in the 2014 data an assumption was made that in the case of some suburban locations for the most part previously permitted apartment schemes were not viable. In such cases projections were adjusted i.e. reduced and included in Tier 2(b) where no policy of physical constraint exists but a new permission would be required. The 2015 data includes the units of all permitted residential developments over 10 units (excluding part 8 developments and student accommodation) which can be immediately implemented within the Tier 1 column.
- The data within the 2014 report was based on the data collected for Q2 2014 whereas, the data used for the 2016 Report was based on the data collected for Q4 2015. This is worth noting as the year end is historically a busy period in terms of planning applications being lodged.
- The completion of reviews and analysis of SDZ's within the local authorities' areas has significantly increased the potential under this heading.

The definition behind the various Tiers is set out. On this basis it is clear that the availability of planning permission is not a constraint at this point in time. A greater understanding of the

ownership of these permissions and the reasons as to why they are not being operationalised is necessary. In part it is no doubt due to the quantum of land tied up in financial arrangements including receiverships etc. It may also be due to viability issues including the historical burden of land costs , access to development finance and mobilisation costs generally which are referred to later.

	Tier 1 Totals <sup>1</sup>		Breakdown of Tier 1 Totals						Tier 2(a) <sup>2</sup>		Tier 2 (b)	Totals
			Tier 1 units built to date		Tier 1 units permitted but not commenced		Tier 1 Units under construction					
	Houses	Apts	Houses	Apts	Houses	Apts	Houses	Apts	Houses	Apts	Units	Units
FCC	8661	6965	2331	1886	5308	4691	1022	388	1431	1076	11845	29978
DCC	1693	3678	(56)	(0)	1254	3313	383	365	671	1428	8789	16259
SDCC	3652	2606	(850)	(769)	2668	1590	134	247	637	83	13289	20267
DLRCC	1985	4803	(270)	(870)	882	2905	833	1028	790	796	14026	22400
Total	15991	18052	3507	3525	10112	12499	2372	2028	3529	3383	47949	88904

#### Tier 1:

This relates to sites where planning permission has been granted and the permission can be immediately implemented. While the taskforce is not in a position to assess the deliverability of individual permissions it is clear that these are contemporary permissions assumed to have being through their own rigorous viability assessment. This figure includes developments in which some housing units have been already completed or are currently under construction or have yet to start construction. The above table splits Tier 1 sites into 3 separate columns as follows:

- ‘Units built to date’ demonstrates how many units have already been completed to date in the relevant active Tier 1 sites. This figure does not relate to how many units have been completed during a particular quarter. Former Tier 1 developments which have been completed entirely are subsequently removed from the Tier 1 list, and unit numbers relating to such fully completed developments are not represent in the updated Table.
- ‘Number of Permitted Units’ is based on the number of units permitted in the relevant Tier 1 planning permissions. These figures include developments in which some housing units have already been completed or are currently underway, as indicated in the columns ‘Total Number of Units Built to Date’ and/or ‘Under Construction’.
- ‘Total permitted but not commenced’ represents the remaining element of the development which has yet to be commenced.

**Tier 2(a):**

Sites where planning applications has been lodged with a planning authority. Entries for these sites include cases where the planning authority has made a decision on a planning application and that decision is under appeal to An Bord Pleanala.

**Tier 2(b):**

This relates to lands which are zoned and where there is an appropriate planning policy in place or being put in places, and there is no insurmountable infrastructure constraint which cannot be resolved. These are sites which may have the potential to accommodate development, but, this does not infer any presumption as to the likelihood or otherwise of a grant of permission for any particular development.

On the ground activity in relation to permissions being utilised is more positive. At the end of QTR 1 2016 there are 123 active housing construction sites across Dublin with 4400 units under construction. This compares to 91 sites yielding 2300 units at the end of QTR 2 2015.

Planning Authority	Tier	Active Sites	Units Under Construction	No. of Houses Under Construction	No. of Apartments Under Construction
DLR	1	37	1861	833	1028
SDCC	1	17	381	134	247
DCC	1	19	748	383	365
FCC	1	50	1410	1022	388
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>4400</b>	<b>2372</b>	<b>2028</b>

Notwithstanding the availability of permissions as reported in June 2014 planning applications and more importantly units permitted have increased substantially in 2015 over 2014 i.e. from 2752 to 6310 or 130%.

CSO Quarterly Breakdown of Apartments and Houses (2014)								
Local Authority	Quarter 1		Quarter 2		Quarter 3		Quarter 4	
	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments
DCC	131	57	76	19	109	203	262	80
SDCC	82	22	108	3	52	0	81	4
DLR	158	35	57	1	108	69	51	6
FCC	162	8	288	2	269	2	244	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>93</b>

CSO Quarterly Breakdown of Apartments and Houses (2015)								
Local Authority	Quarter 1		Quarter 2		Quarter 3		Quarter 4	
	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments	Houses	Apartments
<b>DCC</b>	214	545	167	173	80	103	125	742
<b>SDCC</b>	268	14	309	14	427	80	524	81
<b>DLR</b>	125	46	120	58	53	25	106	294
<b>FCC</b>	242	8	459	104	303	35	410	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>1055</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>1165</b>	<b>1173</b>

## The Market and Affordability

Based on its own analysis and the numerous reports of established estate agents it is clear that the market such as it is, is getting greater traction in those areas commanding higher house prices in both north and south Dublin as well as the western Suburbs within the M50. By coincidence these transactions are 47% cash based in which begs the question s to whether this cohort will in the short term have its demand satisfied. It is likewise noticeable that there is limited product being brought to the market at what would be ordinarily be deemed affordable to the general population i.e. valued at around €300,000.

The most common reaction is to point towards central bank lending requirements. Its own review is awaited but in the meantime it remains uncertain as to the extent of its contribution to the lack of housing supply. It is however accepted that its rules have has the effect of dampening house price growth which should be seen as a positive in a market that is already exhibiting affordability issues. A more plausible explanation to the slow pipeline of affordable housing may result from a combination of issues including the understandable slowness to market restoration as market profile and its certainty remain under review. It is very evident from the recent high levels of block sales that large tracts of developable land have been kept from the market due to banking and receivership considerations. This is likely to change in the next twelve months.

The profile of the market has also changed with a significant number of intermediate households now needing state support to access affordable housing. The recently announced fund of €10m for a pilot affordable rental initiative in this context is very welcome and the rules around its accessibility are eagerly awaited. Affordable rental is likely to be a significant element of tenure mix into the future and this is supported by the research carried out by the Housing Agency among others.

## Economic Viability

The issue of affordability is linked to persistent arguments around the viability of construction in the context of prevailing sales prices. This has led to calls for VAT reductions, abolition of development levies, changes to Part V requirements and greater flexibility in design standards. It is beyond the

remit of this report to examine these issues in detail, however there are a number of issues which require further critical examination.

The cost of housing has always being unduly influenced by land prices. Current SCSi estimate of site costs of €57,500 per unit is consistent with previous work in this area. The overriding concern is that presently and historically, land supply, in the sense of land being obtained by housing providers at reasonable prices reflecting prevailing house prices achievable, tends to be extremely irregular with no certainty that land zoned will actually get developed. There is no means to align supply requirements with demand and to share betterment values to the benefit of those in need of housing.

The taskforce is therefore of the view that we must again look at dealing with this fundamental structural cost issue which disproportionately contributes to house price inflation in the form of active land management instruments, including strategic acquisition and disposal of lands in the context of an overview of the efficiency of the land market to do this on its own.

Active land management, which may even include local authority land banking and enhanced CPO powers could be considered. This matter has been examined in some detail previously by NESC in its 2004 report on “Housing in Ireland: Performance and Policy”. It may be time to revisit its recommendations.

In its second report the taskforce recommended the establishment of a strategic infrastructure investment fund to assist developers with the cost of providing front loaded infrastructure. It remains the case that banks are unprepared to finance up front site development costs associated with enabling infrastructure. It is again recommended that a strategic infrastructure investment fund along the lines recommended be established and opened to applications which could be adjudicated on their merits using transparent and published criteria.

The second report of the taskforce identified some exemplar projects but would suggest that the fund not be limited to those alone and also be open to local authorities to open up land for social housing or joint venture projects. The following action is identified in the programme for government which is very welcome;

“We will re-prioritise the capital programme to put in place a new €100million Local Infrastructure Housing Fund, from which local authorities can deliver local projects needed to unlock development land in high demand areas. (Year 1 Action)” [Page 24]

In conjunction with the establishment of such a fund, institutional arrangements and an implementation framework need to be urgently agreed. While accepting that this is ultimately a matter for DHPLG and the Department of Finance, the Taskforce would recommend that serious consideration be given to the following in order to maximise the potential return on investment

- Applicability, in the first instance, should be targeted to those areas which are strategically important to achieving the balanced development of the Dublin metropolitan area and are identified as such within the existing planning policy framework.
- Local authorities would apply for funding, either in relation to their own projects or joint venture proposals with housing providers.
- Investment should discriminate in favour of those projects which yield the greatest return of housing units at affordable prices and in the most immediate timeframe possible.
- Within carefully defined criteria reflecting the points above, a call for proposals could be initiated.

- Applications should be made in the first instance to an assessment panel convened and chaired by the Department of Housing Planning and Local Government.
- Applications should be accompanied by a “certificate of planning need” by the relevant local authority and an agreed “form of undertaking” by the landowner that housing construction will immediately follow within a specified timeframe.
- Funding where approved should be channelled through the relevant state agency e.g. NTA, TII, relevant local authority etc.
- Funding, where approved, should also be co-ordinated with other on-going infrastructural investment from existing capital investment programmes.
- A coordinated project management monitoring and delivery mechanism for projects funded under the measure needs to be agreed between the Department and relevant local authorities across the entire Dublin area.

## **Additional Delivery Capacity Considerations**

The issue of access to funds generally at a sustainable cost remains a considerable concern for the construction sector. There appears to be a distinction emerging between very large operators who are achieving financial value through economies of scale and smaller builders who are having difficulty with mobilisation costs including modest land purchase and ongoing working capital.

A sustainable construction sector needs large as well as smaller builders. There is a need for more detailed consideration of how to attract new developers, builders and contractors into the sector to ensure competitiveness, natural replenishment of skills and sufficient diversity of interest across projects and opportunities of all sizes.

One way to ensure a functioning cohort of smaller to medium sized housing developers would be to use active land management initiatives to enhance access to “ready to go” plots, which could be developed on local authority or other public lands not directly required for public housing building programmes. Strategic acquisition of privately owned sites, perhaps redevelopment and infill opportunities or with fragmented ownerships could be another area to examine the potential for active land management to enhance capacity where the bigger operators would not be interested in such endeavours and where smaller housing developers would not be able to bear acquisition and finance costs and timescales.

Another aspect of replenishing the capacity mentioned above would be a detailed current skills audit carried out by DSP, SOLAS and the CIF in order to inform training and capacity requirements.

NAMA has been mandated by government to establish a residential delivery division and it has significantly accelerated its activity in the past six months in the interests of boosting housing supply and contributing to economic recovery generally. To date it has completed 2576 dwellings, a further 2345 under construction and secured planning for a further 4282. Its target is to deliver 20,000 residential units by 2020 subject to commercial viability. There has been a good deal of commentary around the possibility and need for a greater social dividend from this programme in the context of social and affordable housing provision.

Whereas the revised Part V arrangements require 10% of all residential development sites to be reserved for social housing, there is an argument to say that that proportion could be increased by agreement between NAMA and its funded housing providers and the relevant local authority and/or approved housing body. This merits further and immediate consideration.

## Conclusions

- (1) While a variety of activity indicators show positive trends as regards land sales, planning application numbers etc., there is not a significant increase in the development of housing in the metropolitan area of Dublin in the volumes considered necessary.
- (2) The issue of affordable prices is now the focus of much attention since the introduction of reasonable Central Bank macro-prudential lending policies.
- (3) To the extent that development is activating and buoyancy of transactions resulting, whether for the rental or sales markets, such development appears aimed at the middle to higher end of what the generality of buyers and renters can afford.
- (4) Housing providers continue to point to difficulties in delivering more affordable price points in the market for a variety of reasons. It is the view of the taskforce that active land management and advance infrastructure funding mechanisms could address some of these issues.
- (5) The Programme for Government commitment to establish a strategic infrastructure fund is welcomed and its implementation should be advanced swiftly and targeted to maximise affordable output from strategic sites across the Dublin Metropolitan area.
- (6) A vibrant and competitive housing development sector needs a range of differently scaled developers and active land management mechanisms should be considered in ensuring a reasonable supply of “ready to go” sites for small to medium sized operators.
- (7) As the private housing providers gear up, there is an opportunity to examine NAMA funded developments with a view to increasing, by agreement, the provision of social housing off these sites.
- (8) The Task Force is happy to engage with the Department on steps that should be taken to address the above conclusions.

**Report to the Planning, International Relations & Property Development  
Strategic Policy Committee  
June 2016**

## **Coca-Cola Zero dublinbikes**

### **Subscription Payment Options Evaluation**

In April 2016, the Planning Department presented a report on potential funding options for Coca-Cola Zero dublinbikes to the Planning SPC. This report included several proposals designed to deliver the current scheme at a cost neutral basis to the council and to provide the resources for future expansion. One of the recommendations contained in the report is the consideration of an increase in the long term subscription tariff by €10 to €30, over a period of two years. As part of the discussion surrounding the funding report, the Planning Department were requested to examine options that would enhance access to the scheme for students and unwaged as part of any proposed subscription increase. This evaluation has been incorporated into the wider examination of funding options that is scheduled to be completed before the autumn. At this time it is expected that the Leapcard and Coca-Cola Zero dublinbikes card will be integrated. This may give rise to other technical options.

Currently members of the public have two payment options to subscribe as members of the scheme. Annual members subscribe online at [www.dublinbikes.ie](http://www.dublinbikes.ie) by credit card or direct debit. Short term members can purchase a three day membership by credit card at credit card enabled station terminals. For technical reasons, debit cards are not currently accepted.

At present, membership of the scheme requires a €150 guarantee to minimise theft and vandalism within the scheme. This does discourage some potential customers from using the scheme. However, the ability to provide more open access to the scheme must be balanced against the threat of damage and misuse. Vandalism and theft have been kept at reasonably low levels but serious incidents do occur. There is concern that serious incidents are becoming more frequent. The €150 guarantee helps to minimise the frequency of such incidents and is still required to stop vandalism and theft becoming ongoing features in the management of the scheme. Vandalism and theft have a financial impact for both Dublin City Council and JCDecaux, and seriously impact on the day-to-day functioning of the scheme.



No alternative payment option has been identified as yet that would provide the same level of security in relation to the required guarantee.

For clarity, the scheme guarantee is only ever debited in the event of failure to comply with the Terms & Conditions of the scheme. The National Transport Authority's regional bike share schemes, which are modelled on Dublin City Council's successful Coca-Cola Zero dublinbikes scheme closely duplicate the same terms and conditions of use, including the requirement to agree to the provision of a €150 security deposit.

**Jim Keogan**  
**Assistant Chief Executive**

## **Report to the Planning, International Relations & Property Development Strategic Policy Committee June 2016**

### **Planning Decision Timelines**

If a pre application consultation is requested it is facilitated within 10 working days on average from the date of request to the date of meeting.

All planning applications must go through a validation process to ensure that the provisions of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and associated regulations have been complied with by the applicant. This process generally takes approximately 5 working days from the date of lodgement. It is incumbent on the applicant's agent to ensure that all the relevant documentation including newspaper advertisement, site notice, drawings and any other required associated documentation are present and correct at the time of lodgement. Every effort is made by the Planning Department to validate applications where possible.

All planning applications must be decided within 8 weeks of lodgement to either grant or refuse permission or to request further information. The earliest a decision can be made is 6 weeks from date of lodgement.

If the request is for further information the applicant has up to 6 months to lodge this information but can lodge it the following day after receipt of the request.

The planning authority must make a decision either to grant or refuse within 4 weeks of receipt of the further information unless the application is the subject of an EIS then its 8 weeks.

A final grant of permission cannot be issued until 4 weeks has elapsed from the date of initial grant by a local authority in case there is An Appeal lodged with An Bord Pleanála. In the case where a decision on an application is appealed to the Bord their decision is final and binding.

A decision to grant or refuse an application can be appealed to An Bord Pleanála by the Applicant or a third party objector within a 4 week period from the date of the decision of a

Local Authority. An Bord Pleanála has a self imposed target of 14 weeks from the date of receipt of the appeal to make a decision however for large scale applications they often exceed this timeframe, which is not statutory in nature.

**Jim Keogan**

**Assistant Chief Executive**

This page is intentionally left blank