

TRUTZ HAASE

Social & Economic Consultant

Community Gain

**A Social and Community Infrastructure Audit in the
Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area**

Trutz Haase

in association with

Brady Shipman Martin

June 2006

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The Aims of this Study	1
1.2	The Scope of this Study	1
1.3	The Method of this Study	3
1.4	Structure of the Report.....	4
2	The Context	5
2.1	Ireland's Economic Boom and Resulting Pressure on Infrastructure	5
2.2	The Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region	6
2.3	The HGV Management Strategy.....	6
2.4	The Redevelopment of the Dublin Docklands Area.....	7
2.5	The Dublin Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework	9
3	The Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area.....	11
3.1	A Geographic and Historical Profile of the Catchment Area.....	11
3.2	Threats and Opportunities	12
3.3	A Holistic Approach to the Development of Sustainable Communities	13
4	The Dublin Waste to Energy Project.....	14
4.1	The Project.....	14
4.2	Consulting with the Community	17
5	Community Gain	20
5.1	The Concept of Community Gain.....	21
5.2	Learning from Other Experiences in Ireland	22
5.3	Identifying Possible Impacts	25
5.4	Defining the Scope of Consultation and Negotiation	26
6	The Community Gain Fund	28
6.1	Organisational Considerations.....	28
6.2	Developing a Shared Vision of Community Needs and Aspirations.....	31
7	A Social and Community Audit of the Catchment Area.....	33
7.1	Socio-economic Profile of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area	33
7.2	An Analysis of Needs based on the Census Data	36
7.3	Physical Profile of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area.....	37
7.4	An Analysis of Needs from the Physical Audit.....	41
7.5	An Analysis of Needs from the MRBI Household Survey	44
7.6	Potential Benefits from a Community Gain Fund.....	46
8	Recommendations	50
9	Bibliography	52
10	Appendix 1: Forfás (2001) Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland	54
11	Appendix 2: A Socio-Economic Profile	59
12	Appendix 3: Listing of Entities included in Physical Audit	65

Figures and Tables

Table 5.1	Different Forms of Planning Gain Employed Internationally	21
Table 7.1:	Social & Community Provisions.....	37
Table 7.2:	Education & Training Provisions.....	37
Table 7.3:	Sports and Recreational Amenities	39
Table 7.10:	Sports and Recreation Standards	41
Table A7.1:	Overall Affluence/Deprivation Scores.....	59
Table A7.2:	Demographic Characteristics	60
Table A7.3:	Family Characteristics	61
Table A7.4:	Unemployment Rates	62
Table A7.5:	Social Class Characteristics	63
Table A7.6:	Education Levels	64

Abbreviations

CDYSB	City of Dublin Youth Services Board
CFG	Community Gain Fund
CIG	Community Interest Group
DCC	Dublin City Council
DDDA	Dublin Docklands Development Authority
DEHLG	Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government
DICP	Dublin Inner City Partnership
EA	Enumerative Area
ED	Electoral District
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESB	Electricity Supply Board
ESRI	Economic and Social Research Institute
HARP	Historical Area Rejuvenation Plan
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
IAP	Integrated Area Plan
IFSC	International Financial Services Centre
LA	Local Authority
MRBI	Market Research Firm
NESC	National Economic and Social Council
NPFA	National Playing Fields Association (UK)
PEA	Pembroke East A (ED)
PEB	Pembroke East B (ED)
PEC	Pembroke East C (ED)
PESP	Programme for Economic and Social Progress
PWA	Pembroke West A (ED)
RAPID	Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and Development
SWICN	South West Inner City Network
VTOS	Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme

Executive Summary

The four Dublin Local Authorities have agreed an integrated Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region, which includes the provision of a Waste-to-Energy facility on the Poolbeg Peninsula. If the incinerator is built, Dublin City Council will establish a Community Gain Fund to confer some benefit to the communities most affected by the location of the incinerator.

To maximise the potential gain from the Fund, Dublin City Council has commissioned Trutz Haase, an independent Social & Economic Consultant, in association with Brady Shipman Martin, to undertake an audit of the social and community infrastructure in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. This report details the findings of their in-depth community consultation which took place from January to April 2006.

Background

The Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region 2005-2010 has been developed jointly by Dublin City Council, South Dublin County Council, Fingal County Council and Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council. The Plan follows latest government policy in that it develops a waste management strategy for the region as a whole. It also takes into account important European requirements towards reduced waste production, more recycling, and the development of environmentally more sustainable forms of final disposal. To reduce the amount of waste going into landfill, and in line with many of the other regional waste management plans that are currently being developed throughout Ireland, the Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region also envisages the building of a Waste to Energy facility on the Poolbeg peninsula.

After Carranstown (County Meath) and Ringaskiddy (County Cork) the Dublin Waste to Energy Project will be the third case of its kind entering the statutory process in Ireland. The pending planning application for the incinerator has already given rise to considerable public comment through the media, both in support of its speedy construction, as well as against waste incineration in general and on the Poolbeg peninsula in particular, and the project has the potential to develop into a major environmental conflict. Every possible step, thus, has to be undertaken to reach a mutual accommodation between the interests and needs of the wider community and those of the communities most affected by the location of the proposed incinerator.

Current Government policy suggests that this is best done by applying the concept of Community Gain and, over the past few years, it has become standard practice for a condition to be attached to the grant of planning permission for major pieces of waste infrastructure, requiring the operators to contribute to a special fund which is used to support certain initiatives in the local area. It is in anticipation of a similar planning condition from An Bord Pleanála with regard to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, that Dublin City Council asked the consultants to undertake a social and community audit of the three communities most affected and to assist them in identifying how gaps in the provision of community facilities and infrastructure might best be addressed through such fund.

The Scope of the Study

In the course of consultation with key representatives of the communities, it became quickly apparent that the scope of the study had to be broadened beyond its original remit. The majority of residents of the adjacent communities are strongly opposed to the siting of the incinerator on the Poolbeg peninsula, so the question arises as to whether a Community Gain Fund as stipulated by Dublin City Council has the capacity to address the key needs and aspirations of the local communities in such a way that it can provide an effective tool for consensus building.

Similar questions have recently been voiced by the National Economic and Social Council (NESC): In light of the growing number of environmental conflicts that have developed in Ireland over the past decade, the NESC states in its 2006 Strategy that it plans to undertake a study on environmental policy. As international experience suggests that there are more effective approaches to conflict resolution than commonly adopted in Ireland, one theme of that study is likely to be the structures and procedures of conflict resolution and consensus building currently applied.

The Dublin Waste to Energy Project is an essential element of the agreed *Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region*. Given the considerable conflict with the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities that could arise from this, it is impossible for the consultants to undertake the present study without also giving regard to the process by which a potential conflict can be avoided and a mutual accommodation be sought between the needs of the wider community, as represented through Dublin City Council and the Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region, and the interests of the local communities that are most affected by the location of the proposed incinerator.

Community Gain

Current Government policy states that *“the concept of community gain recognises the reality that if Ireland is to deal with its waste in a modern environmentally progressive way, new facilities have to be provided. It operates on the basis that the facilities will have to be located somewhere and that there should be a mechanism by which some benefit can accrue to the communities in the location chosen.”* (Waste Management – Taking Stock and Moving Forward). It further attempts to specifically ‘de-link’ the concept of community gain from a perception of “buying-off” objecting communities.

However, independent of whether the Irish Government acknowledges the need for an *appropriate* gain as an essential element of conflict resolution and mutual accommodation, international studies, as well as previous Government documents, clearly state that the key aspect of ‘community gain’ is that it offers a proportionate benefit for alleviating the inequity and perceived losses incurred by a community when proposed major infrastructure is planned for its locality. Internationally, ‘community gain’ has been implemented in one of three forms: ‘community gain’, ‘planning gain’ or ‘host community benefits’. Whichever its precise form, the studies show that key to the concept of Community Gain being successful in the building of consensus are *negotiated agreements* between the local communities affected and the developers who will be in charge of the development of the facility.

Building Consensus

The key to building consensus lies in some real gain being obtained by the communities most affected by the location of the incinerator. The immediate question thus becomes: *“what are the host communities’ needs and aspirations?”* Only if this question can be answered in a comprehensive manner, can one determine the precise form of Community Gain that may achieve consensus building. In some cases, it may be appropriate and sufficient to ensure Community Gain by means of a Community Gain Fund which, in turn, is used to finance a number of projects which benefit the community. In other cases, it may be necessary to respond to the wider needs and aspirations of the affected communities with regard to the overall development of their area.

The search for a consensus and mutual accommodation thus has to start with true consultation and negotiation between the representatives of the interests of the wider community and the local communities which are being asked to accept the waste facility in their proximity. In the case of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, the inclusion of incineration as part of the overall waste management strategy is an agreed policy both at national and regional level, a fact that can not simply be overruled by any one community. On the other hand, and partly as a result of its unique location, the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount

areas frequently have had to facilitate infrastructure developments of regional or even national importance with little consideration given to the cumulative effects which these developments have on the communities in question. The audit of the social and community infrastructure of the three areas as presented in this study includes both the consideration of how best to maximise the benefit of a Community Gain Fund if instituted as part of a planning permission for the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, as well as the needs of the communities in the wider context of the future development of their area.

Gaps in Community Facilities and Infrastructure

Concentrating on the needs of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area in terms of community facilities and infrastructure; i.e. those elements which can meaningfully be addressed through a Community Gain Fund, the study identifies five priorities which, if appropriately addressed, could maximise the benefit accruing to the communities from such fund:

The first priority emerging from the household survey are more sports facilities for young people. This contrasts with several other studies which generally describe the area as one relatively well provided for in terms of sport facilities, a view supported by the consultants' own audit of the area. The apparent contradiction can, however, be explained when taking into account who actually makes use of the existing facilities. Access to the existing sports facilities is not evenly spread across all geographical areas or social spectrum. Thus, besides the provision of additional sports facilities, particular emphasis needs to be given towards the employment of sports coaches and the development of outreach programmes which draw a wider range of young people towards the existing opportunities.

The second priority relates to the availability of playgrounds. There is a dearth of playgrounds in the whole study area. The lack of access to playgrounds is particularly felt in the Ringsend and Irishtown area, as well as amongst younger families and those who are financially less well-off.

The third priority relates to the availability of community services for elderly people. While the shortage in community services for elderly people is not particular to the study area, it is a strongly felt issue and the Community Gain Fund could provide an important dimension in the improvement of such services which would be perceived as a real benefit to the area.

The fourth priority is the improvement of community health services. While mirroring the lack of services for elderly people with regard to the age groups which identify both as a priority, the lack of community health services is further particularly felt in the Ringsend and Irishtown areas, as well as amongst less well-off families and those with larger number of children.

The fifth priority is the improvement of the environment, which is strongly felt across all three communities particularly with regard to improved landscaping and the appearance of the built environment. There are some differences in emphasis with regard to environmental protection and the provision of environmental and/or heritage facilities, which are stronger felt in the Sandymount area.

The consultants believe that the identified priorities might best be served through the development of two flagship projects: a community centre for the Ringsend and Irishtown area with a strong focus on young people, including the provision of sport and recreation, and a community centre for the Sandymount area with an emphasis on providing offices and meeting rooms for the residents organisations, as well as an interpretive and environmental dimension. Both centres would provide an anchor for (outreach) services for the elderly, as well as housing primary health services. Overall, the centres would aim at providing a new focus for civic and community activities, a focus which is currently lacking.

Developing Community Representation

The degree of benefit accruing to the communities from a Community Gain Fund and the projects supported by it, will crucially depend upon the degree of ownership that the communities perceive with regard to the flagship projects and the fund as a whole. To this end, the process by which these projects are being developed is likely to be as important as the centres themselves.

Currently there exists no structure in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area which allows the communities to develop a shared vision for their area. Several attempts to engage in a process to this end over the past decade have come to a halt, with the result that community interests are fragmented and lack adequate representation.

The consultants believe that a Community Gain Fund, if instituted as part of the planning permission for the proposed incinerator, could have an important catalyst role to initiate a process by which different community interests will come together and develop a shared vision for the improvement of their area.

Addressing the Wider Aspirations of the Community

The appropriate management of the Community Gain Fund constitutes an important end in itself. The greatest benefit to the communities, however, could result from developing an Integrated Plan for their area and the building of effective institutions of community representation vis-à-vis Dublin City Council, Government departments and statutory agencies.

There is clear evidence from the consultation with community representatives undertaken in the course of the social and community audit that part of the opposition to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project is related to a range of other issues where the communities feel that their interests have not been sufficiently guarded and where there has been insufficient consultation. These issues include, amongst others, the overall land use of the Poolbeg peninsula, the gains for the communities from the redevelopment of the docklands, questions with regard to the protection of the coastal zone, the smells from the waste water treatment plant, and the effects of the introduction of the HGV Management Strategy, amongst others.

While there are mechanisms in place by which residents can respond and make submissions to each of the individual plans, no consideration is given to the cumulative effect of the developments on the existing communities, nor is sufficient space given to the communities to develop an Integrated Plan for their area, which they can identify with and which provides a basis for effective community representation on all of these issues.

Based on their consultation, it is the consultants' belief that the Community Gain Fund, if taken on its own, will not be perceived as sufficient benefit for the adversely affected communities and thus fail to achieve mutual accommodation with regard to the Waste to Energy Project. If consensus is to be built, it is most likely to be driven by the application of the concept of Community Gain and/or Planning Gain with regard to the wider development issues which the communities face.

In summary: the Community Gain Fund may provide a useful first step, but its success is likely to be influenced by the commitment of Dublin City Council towards supporting the development of an Integrated Plan for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, the building of stable structures of community representation, and a commitment to true consultation and negotiation through these structures on some of the wider development issues with which the three communities are currently confronted.

Key Recommendations

In the light of the discussion provided throughout the report, the consultants make a limited number of key recommendations.

1. Achieving True Community Representation

Consultation and negotiation with the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities has to start with taking account of what the real issues, needs and aspirations of these communities are and which of these may form part of a negotiated settlement between the Local Authority, private developer and the affected communities. To this end, Dublin City Council should assist the communities to develop an infrastructure which allows them to formulate, communicate, and ultimately negotiate their concerns.

2. Acknowledging a Comprehensive Definition of Community Gain

Current government policy does endorse the concept of 'community gain', but merely requires that some benefit shall accrue to communities in which proximity major pieces of waste infrastructure are being located. Dublin City Council's intention to set up a Community Gain Fund, if planning permission is granted to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, is thus within the current minimum requirements.

However, the key aspect of 'community gain' is that it offers some form of compensation for alleviating the inequity and perceived losses incurred by a community when a proposed waste facility is planned for its locality. Internationally, 'community gain' has been implemented in one of three forms: 'community gain', 'planning gain' or 'host community benefits'. To provide a successful basis for consensus building and conflict resolution it is likely that community gain needs to be sought outside the confines of a purely monetary Community Gain Fund.

3. Entering into Real Consultation and Negotiation with the Local Communities

The statutory process is *not* the place of consultation and negotiation. Real consultation and negotiation between Dublin City Council, the private developers, and the three communities should have taken place from the time the proposal for an incinerator on the Poolbeg Peninsula was first made.

While Dublin City Council has made considerable efforts in disseminating information about the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, residents do not perceive this to be objective and independent. Furthermore, information is no substitute for consultation and negotiation. A meaningful process of consultation and consensus building requires appropriate structures of community representation and a comprehensive approach to community gain. Such an approach is also likely to make the management and operation of any ensuing Community Gain Fund more acceptable to the community.

4. Clarifying the Scope of What Can be Negotiated

The scope of what can be negotiated has to take into account the overall needs of the communities most affected by the location of the incinerator. The gains sought by the communities do not have to necessarily be connected directly with the proposed incinerator, nor do they necessarily have to be defined in terms of the benefits accruing on foot of a Community Gain Fund.

Based on international literature and experience, mutual accommodation with regard to the siting of waste facilities has worked best where the authorities have been able to take key aspirations of the respective communities into account. Based on the consultation with community representatives in the course of this study, it is the consultants' belief that the wider issues that surround the development of the communities may be more important than the benefit that may accrue through a Community Gain Fund on its own.

5. Supporting the Development of an Integrated Plan

There is a long history of the use of the Poolbeg Peninsula to provide for the wider needs of Dublin and the region as a whole, with little consideration given to the cumulative effects which this may have on the residents of adjacent communities. Best practice in Ireland and elsewhere shows that the overall development of an area can be framed by means of developing a plan for the area that treats the area in its totality, taking into account the full range of influences, in terms of land use, transport, economic and social issues and environmental impacts. While Dublin City Council has commenced this process with the publication of the Draft Poolbeg/Southbank Framework Plan, there is a need for the communities to develop an Integrated Plan for their area which takes as its starting point the visions and aspirations of the existing communities. Dublin City Council should undertake every step necessary to facilitate the communities to develop appropriate structures of community representation and provide them with the resources necessary to develop such a Plan.

6. Respecting the Interests of the Affected Communities

The communities of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area are under renewed pressure as the area is being affected by a number of large-scale development proposals and city policies, each with a different focus and spatial remit, and none of which considers the combined effects on the residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. Furthermore, the Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region names the Poolbeg Peninsula as the preferred location for a large-scale incinerator to serve the whole of the Dublin region, which is perceived as the largest single threat to the adjacent communities.

The Integrated Plan is likely to recommend potential solutions to the main issues of concern to the community. It is the responsibility of Dublin City Council to take these seriously, enter into consultation with regard to the issues identified and, ultimately, enter into a process of negotiation with the communities about these. This is the true meaning of 'community gain' and this will be reflected in an adopted Integrated Plan accepted by the community.

7. The Community Gain Fund

Based on the extensive audit of the existing community facilities and infrastructure, and the preferences expressed by residents in course of the MRBI household survey, the consultants identify five priorities which should be addressed by the Community Gain Fund: (i) more sports facilities for young people, (ii) more playgrounds, (iii) better community services for elderly people (iv) better community health services, and (v) improving the environment.

Based on an analysis of the social and economic composition of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, there is some merit to addressing social need, which, as a whole is more strongly concentrated in Ringsend and Irishtown. On the other side, the Community Gain Fund has to provide a reasonably equal benefit to all communities that are affected by the location of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project. Thus, there also has to be a substantive gain to accrue for the residents in Sandymount.

Taking account of the five priorities, the social and economic composition of the area, a fair geographical distribution, and the lack of structures for effective community representation, the consultants believe that the Community Gain Fund should largely be used for the development of two flagship projects: firstly, a large-scale re-building of the Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre and, secondly, a Community Centre for the Sandymount area.

In each case, the centres would act as a centre of community supports along the five priorities identified. The fund would be able to cater both for the associated capital costs, as well as covering the ongoing costs associated with the initiatives. Of equal importance would be that the centres would act as a focus for developing better structures of community representation and towards a process by which the communities can enter effective consultation and negotiation with the respective authorities.

1 Introduction

The four Dublin Local Authorities have agreed an integrated Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region, which includes the provision of a Waste to Energy facility on the Poolbeg Peninsula. If the incinerator is granted planning permission, Dublin City Council will establish a Community Gain Fund as a means to compensate the affected communities for the real and perceived dis-benefits which the location of the incinerator in their vicinity entails.

To maximise the potential benefit from the Fund, Dublin City Council has commissioned Trutz Haase¹, an independent Social & Economic Consultant, in association with Brady Shipman Martin², to undertake an audit of the Social and Community Infrastructure in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. This report details the findings of their in-depth community consultation which took place from January to April 2006.

1.1 The Aims of this Study

The overall aim of the study, as stated in the brief to the consultants, is to carry out a profiling of the community infrastructure in the defined catchment area, to identify gaps that exist in that infrastructure, and to recommend projects and facilities that would bridge those gaps, supported by a Community Gain Fund. In particular, the study was to:

- present a profile of the existing social and community infrastructure in the catchment area;
- develop a comparative framework by which to assess the relative quality of the existing infrastructure, as well as identifying good models of practice in other communities;
- evaluate the existing community infrastructure and undertake a gaps analysis; and
- recommend an outline of the facilities and infrastructure that would maximise the gains for the community.

1.2 The Scope of this Study

From the outset, and from the initial consultations with representatives of the respective communities, it became apparent that the scope of the study had to be broadened beyond its original remit.

Dublin City Councils' intention to institute a Community Gain Fund, if planning permission is granted to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, follows current Government thinking as spelt out in *Waste Management – Taking Stock and Moving Forward* (DEHLG, 2004). In this, Government restates its commitment in relation to developing further the concept of community gain in association with the delivery of major infrastructure projects under local authority waste management plans. *“The concept of community gain recognises the reality that if Ireland is to deal with its waste in a modern, environmentally progressive way, new facilities have to be provided. It operates on the basis that the facilities will have to be located*

¹ **Trutz Haase** is one of the leading experts in Ireland in the measurement of quality of life concepts. He is most well known for his development of an *Irish Index of Relative Affluence and Deprivation*. The index is widely used across a number of Government Departments and is the principal tool by which to target resources to communities of particular need.

² **Brady Shipman Martin** has extensive experience in spatial and land use planning at all levels and an extensive track record in spatial planning, site and action area planning. The practice has particular expertise in strategic planning and has a track record of consultancy throughout Europe.

somewhere and that there should be a mechanism by which some benefit can accrue to the communities in the locations ultimately chosen.” (ibid).

Both Government and Dublin City Council distance themselves from the perception that the concept of community gain is an instrument designed to “buy-off” objecting communities but, as spelled out in previous government policy papers (Forfás 2001 and DEHLG 1998), the concept nevertheless has the essential function to compensate communities for any perceived or real inconveniences on foot of locating a major piece of waste infrastructure in proximity to that community. Thus, the anticipated gains have to be looked at in the context of the potential burden.

The most detailed consideration by Government of the concept of community gain has been published in *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* (Forfás, 2001). This report provides an in-depth review of the underlying rationale of community gain, a review of best international practise, and recommendations with regard to its implementation in Ireland. Because of its depth and importance, we include the relevant chapter of the report as an appendix to this study.

Some of the recommendations of *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* have since been included in subsequent Government statements on the siting of major waste infrastructure. *Taking Stock and Moving Forward* (DEO&LG, 2004), for example, takes up the first recommendation that “*Community incentives, in the form of infrastructure or other facilities benefiting the affected local communities should be provided, where appropriate*” (Forfás, 2001), but has not yet implemented the second part of the same recommendation, i.e. that “*criteria for the provision of such incentives should be developed*”. The second recommendation, that “*research should be carried out, in the case of projects where community incentives are relevant, to identify the benefits that will be most effective from the community point of view*” is, in the case of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, effectively being approached through the present study. The Forfás study thus provides a particular strong reference point for the appropriate scope of this study.

Finally, in discussing the key elements of the effective implementation of community gain, the Forfás report highlights the importance of a good relationship between the community, local authority and developer and the need for comprehensive consultation and negotiation. Indeed, the report repeatedly speaks of ‘the negotiation process’ and the need for local government to develop structures that will facilitate communities to engage in effective negotiation.

The issues of environmental conflict resolution and consensus building also feature in the most recent strategy of the National Economic and Social Council. “*International experience suggests that there are more effective approaches to conflict resolution than commonly adopted in Ireland*” (NESC, 2005). The NESC further states that it will include the theme of appropriate structures and procedures of conflict resolution and consensus building in a future study on environmental policy.

Thus, while the comprehensive social and community infrastructure audit remains the main focus of the study, this cannot be done in isolation of the purpose for which community gain is being applied. To provide an effective means towards meaningful consultation and consensus building, the study also has to discuss the wider needs and aspirations of the communities most affected by the location of the proposed incinerator and the scope and form of community gain applied.

1.3 The Method of this Study

Having considered the overall aims and scope of this study, we can now address the methods that we have applied in the course of the study.

Literature Review:

We have undertaken a literature review to extract how other strategic development plans for the wider Dublin region are likely to affect the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. Other elements reviewed include material which documents experiences of other communities with the development of Integrated Area Plans or Area Action Plans, Community Gain Funds, and the institutional and organisational settings to administer local development initiatives. A full review of local sources was examined to identify local community facilities. Studies examining the appropriate extent of community facilities were consulted to ascertain how the study area compared in terms of physical infrastructure.

In-depth Interviews with Key Stakeholders in the Three Communities:

We have undertaken a large number of interviews with community leaders, mainly spokespersons of local resident groups, community groups and other interest groups. We issued a questionnaire to all providers of local sports & recreational services. We have held an open afternoon for two months in the Ringsend Dublin City Council regional office to allow local people to call in and discuss issues concerning the incinerator and the Community Gain Fund with us.

The MRBI Household Survey:

Parallel to the interviews and field work carried out by the consultants, Dublin City Council had commissioned TNS/MRBI to undertake an independent Household Survey. The survey comprised a random sample of 1,000 households in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area and provides important additional information which is being utilised in this report.

Interviews with other Key Informants:

We held a number of interviews with key informants from other communities, in particular to elicit information on best practices in the administration of Community Gain Funds and the appropriate structures to guarantee adequate community representation. We were also particularly interested in other communities' experiences with the running of Community Gain Funds to benefit from the lessons learned elsewhere.

Statistical analysis of Socio-economic Data:

We undertook extensive data analysis of social and economic data from the 2002 Census of Population to provide a detailed profile of the study area.

In-depth On-the-Ground Survey to Capture the Physical Characteristics of the Area:

We undertook an in-depth on-the-ground survey to provide a complete inventory of community facilities in the study area, to complement the literature review. Taken with the interviews with key stakeholders in the area, the material provides the other main source of information for the Audit of Social and Community Infrastructure and the gaps analysis resulting from this. Finally, it provides the basis for the key recommendations with regard to the identified key landmark projects that could be funded by the Community Gain Fund, if such a fund was to be set up.

1.4 Structure of the Report

The report is structured in the following way: Chapter Two looks at the wider context of the study, including Ireland's recent economic boom, the resulting pressure on the completion of major infrastructure projects, the integrated Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region, the HGV Management Strategy for Dublin City, the development of Dublin's Docklands and the Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework.

Chapter Three defines the study area, provides a brief historical profile of the area, and summarises the perceived threats and opportunities which the communities living in the area face.

Chapter Four provides an overview of the issues surrounding the proposed incinerator for the Poolbeg Peninsula. Starting with a brief description of the Waste to Energy facility itself, we report on the perceived burdens to the community, mainly by reference to the comments made by the Community Information Group, results from the recent MRBI survey, and the interviews with community representatives in the area. The chapter also reflects on Dublin City Council's communication with the residents of the affected area to date.

Chapter Five discusses the broader concepts and experiences of 'community gain' and 'planning gain' in the Irish and international context. Why should communities receive financial or other benefits for carrying the burden on behalf of a wider population, and what gains could potentially accrue for them; what is their scope and how do they relate to the key issues identified by the community in question?

Chapter Six looks at the actual setting up of a Community Gain Fund for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, if the incinerator was to be built. What are the considerations with regard to its organisational set-up and day-to-day operation; i.e. its legal status, the composition of its board/membership, whether the community is adequately represented, how decisions are being made, etc. In doing so, the chapter draws on the experience of other existing Community Gain Funds, as well as the URBAN initiative. The chapter concludes by discussing the mechanisms that are needed to deliver the improvements intended and safeguard that the projects/infrastructure developed with the help of the Community Gain Fund are additional to what can reasonably be expected in any comparable community and that this additionality is maintained over time.

Chapter Seven effectively provides the first steps towards developing an '*Integrated Plan*' for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. The chapter starts with a detailed profile of the study area in terms of its social and economic characteristics, based on the 2002 Census of Population. This is followed by a detailed listing of the existing community resources with regard to social & community facilities, education and health facilities, sports & recreation venues and clubs and religious entities, and an analysis of gaps in the existing community infrastructure, based on the two area profiles, the MRBI Survey and in-depth interviews with key stakeholders in the community. The final section summarises the key areas for potential community gains and provides an indication of how, in the view of the consultants, the benefits of a prospective Community Gain Fund may be put to best use.

Chapter Eight contains the consultants' key recommendations.

2 The Context

2.1 Ireland's Economic Boom and Resulting Pressure on Infrastructure

Ireland has experienced an unprecedented economic growth over the past decade, which not only has put an end to the underdevelopment of previous decades, but has also turned Ireland into one of the strongest and fastest growing economies of the European Union. Moreover, commentators expect the generally positive outlook to continue for the immediate to medium term future.

After a decade of generally high growth and low unemployment there is a growing aura of invincibility about the Irish economy. Even the short slowdown of 2001-03 did not lead to an appreciable rise in unemployment. Today, investment in housing is running at an unprecedented rate fuelling growth elsewhere in the economy. The unemployment rate is close to the full-employment level, the lowest in the EU, and Ireland is seen to be the most attractive labour market in Europe for many of its young mobile population. (ESRI 2005).

However, Ireland's economic blessings are not without their own problems. If the country's infrastructure was already weak due to its lack of investment prior to the onset of the economic upturn in the early 1990s, it became even more outdated in face of a rapidly developing economy thereafter. Despite considerable resources being allocated under the current National Development Plan (2000-2006), many major infrastructure projects have been notoriously delayed in completion, creating both inconveniences for the public as well as considerable extra cost to the exchequer.

In terms of the current roads programme under the 2000-2006 NDP, the Government acknowledges that it will take at least a further 2-3 years beyond 2006 to complete the programme of road building set out in it. The other major problem arising is the difficulty of local authorities to site major waste infrastructure projects to implement their new regional waste management strategies.

Indeed, particularly since economic growth started to accelerate, there has developed a growing gap between what people in general perceive are necessary infrastructural facilities and accepting their location near where they live. The simultaneous support for the efficient and timely provision of essential infrastructure projects (e.g. roads, tram lines, QBCs, hospitals, prisons, landfills, and sewage treatment), whilst not wanting them at their own doorstep – generally referred to as the NIMBY attitude - is not a contradiction, but the inevitable outcome of the accelerated economic development.

To address the procedural delays in bringing major projects to construction, the Government has introduced the *Critical Infrastructure Bill* in 2006. The chief aim of the Bill is to streamline the planning procedure for major projects, and to reduce the ability of individuals or groups to halt the process by way of lengthy legal appeals. However, the Bill does not address the issue of how the appropriate authorities can negotiate with individual communities in providing major infrastructure, and how to find an acceptable outcome, both for the wider society and the community directly affected. This issue lies at the centre of the conflict surrounding the location of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project on the Poolbeg Peninsula. Mainly due to the timing of the introduction of the Bill, the planning process for this incinerator is specifically excluded from the Bill. Nevertheless, the more general question of the relationship between society as a whole and particular communities which are affected by the location of major infrastructure projects in their proximity, as well as the development of appropriate processes by which to avoid environmental conflict remain important issues that still need to be addressed.

2.2 The Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region

The *Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region* (Dublin City and County Councils, 2005) has been developed jointly by Dublin City Council, South Dublin County Council, Fingal County Council and Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council.

The Plan takes account of significant developments in national waste policy, as laid out in *Changing Our Ways* (DEHLG, 1998) and *Taking Stock and Moving Forward* (DEHLG, 2004), the *Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area* (2004) which promote the development of a waste management strategy for the Dublin Region as a whole, and European requirements, as set out in the *EU Sixth Environment Action Programme*.

The Dublin Region adopted its first regional waste management strategy in 1997, setting out to replace a system that over-relied on landfill disposal with a new approach based on integrated waste management over a 20 year period. The First Regional Waste Management Plan became effective in 2001 and a review of the Plan has taken place during 2004-2005, culminating in the current Plan.

The key socio-economic parameters underlying the latest plan are a possible increase in the number of households in the Dublin region by over one quarter, from 379,000 in 2002 to over 500,000 in 2014; strong economic growth and employment forecasts, and an intensification of land use within the Dublin region. In face of these impending developments, the overall goal of the Plan is to develop more sustainable methods of waste management than is currently the case. The strategy highlights the need for prevention, minimisation, reuse, recycling and recovery of energy in order to end the current over-reliance on landfill disposal.

Besides an array of initiatives to minimise waste production, improvement of recycling facilities for both household and commercial/industrial waste and the opening of a new municipal landfill in Fingal, the Plan also includes the provision of a Waste to Energy facility to reduce the amount of household waste being deposited in landfills. The incinerator will have a capacity of between 400,000 and 600,000 tonnes per annum and will treat non-hazardous municipal waste. Its preferred location is the Poolbeg Peninsula.

2.3 The HGV Management Strategy

The Dublin Port Tunnel is nearing completion. It is the largest road infrastructure project ever undertaken in the country. Its principal purpose is to provide hauliers a direct access route to Dublin's port, whilst, simultaneously removing much of the Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) from Dublin's inner city roads. To this end, Dublin City Council has adopted a HGV Management Strategy, the implementation of which will follow the completion of the tunnel.

Prior to adoption, the HGV Management Strategy has gone through a number of drafts, many of which proposed a phased introduction of the HGV cordon (DCC, 2006a,b). The final motion adopted by the Council in April 2006, however, foresees the strategy to be implemented in a single phase: *"Dublin City Council agrees to introduce the full-extended cordon (with no surface street access) as and from the 1st January 2007"* (DCC, 2006d).

The HGV Management Strategy is of profound importance to the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities. If, as suggested in some of the earlier drafts (DCC, 2006a,b), a canal cordon had been introduced which prohibits HGVs to enter the Inner City, but leaves open a Southern access route, principally via Beach Road/Strand Road and Sean Moore Road, then the area would have experienced a considerable worsening of congestion on its local roads, which are already operating beyond their capacity.

Being aware of the potential negative effects of the canal cordon on the three communities, Dublin City Council commissioned a special report to examine the level of displacement that could occur. The findings of Dr. MacNicholas (DCC, 2006a) highlight that, if the Cordon was

not extended to include Sean Moore Road, the Southern suburbs could potentially be hit by a displacement of 32 per cent of trucks which are heading to the ports during the daytime, equivalent to an extra 1,400 trucks (with 4 or more axles) on the three communities' local roads. MacNicholas thus recommended that the Cordon be extended to include Sean Moore Road.

As indicated above, Dublin City Council voted in favour of the early sealing-off of the Southern access route. This should have a major positive effect with regard to the overall HGV traffic through the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area and more than compensate for any additional traffic associated with the proposed Waste to Energy facility.

The HGV Management Strategy represents a prime example of how community gain in its wider sense can be achieved. If the issue had been approached in a more inclusive manner with the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities, it could have contributed towards consensus building and mutual accommodation on other issues, such as the incinerator. Unfortunately this opportunity was not availed of.

2.4 The Redevelopment of the Dublin Docklands Area

The redevelopment of the Dublin Docklands Area is the largest undertaking in terms of the built environment Ireland has seen. It encompasses 526ha of land both North and South of the Liffey and will see major social, economic and physical development and effectively change the very appearance of Dublin's inner city.

Due to its central location, and the considerable development potential of the Docklands Area, the Government decided in January 1996 that a strategic approach should be adopted for the renewal and redevelopment of the area and enacted the Dublin Docklands Development Authority Act in 1997. In the same year, the Dublin Docklands Development Authority (DDDA) published the Dublin Docklands Area Master Plan (DDDA 1997), which provides the general framework for the re-development of the area, as updated in 2003.

Primarily a physical development plan, the DDDA has a stated remit with regard to the overall development; i.e. including social and economic objectives, of the five communities which are affected by the plan. The five residential communities which are given specific consideration are on the northside: East Wall, North Strand, and Sheriff Street/North Wall; and on the southside: City Quay/Pearse Street, and Ringsend/Irishtown. We limit our outline here to that area which overlaps with the subject of this study: the Ringsend/Irishtown area.

The strategic objectives of the Master Plan are as follows:

- The development of a wide range of sustainable employment opportunities in the area.
- The development of increased opportunities for local employment in existing and new enterprises in the area.
- The development of an environment which will attract increased investment and employment into the area.
- The continued development and expansion of the International Financial Services Centre (IFSC) in the Docklands.
- The development of sustainable neighbourhoods with sufficient 'critical mass' that will support services such as quality public transport, improved retail facilities and other new amenities.
- The provision of a wide range of new housing in the area in order to achieve a good social mix.
- The integration of new residential communities with existing local communities in the area.
- The development of sustainable transportation for the area, including the promotion of public transport, walking and cycling as alternatives to the private car and improved circulation within the area.

- The improvement of the infrastructure and amenities in the area concurrently with, or in advance of residential, commercial and industrial development.
- The development of the amenity, tourism and employment potential of the water bodies in the area.
- The identification and development of anchor activities and landmark developments which would assist in the regeneration of the area over the period of the Master Plan.
- The promotion of increased access to education and training of all residents in the area.
- The realisation of the potential of Docklands youth.
- The renewal of Dublin City as a whole linking the city centre to Dublin Bay and, in turn, connecting the Docklands Area to the life of the city.
- Promote the sustainable physical renewal of the area to a high environmental standard, reflecting high quality urban design and architecture, combined with efficient energy use. (DDDA:2003)

The DDDA's policy with regards the revitalisation of Ringsend and Irishtown is set out in the Ringsend Area Action Plan (DDDA 2000). The Ringsend AAP re-states the area's strengths and weaknesses as initially formulated in the Master plan as follows:

Strengths:

- the established residential community;
- the relative homogeneity, albeit of a low scale and relatively dense nature, of built fabric;
- the mixed-use nature of the area with its living, working and recreational areas integrated in a self-sufficient manner;
- the extensive nature of public open space in a variety of forms, from riverside walks to seaside heritage areas and urban parks;
- the extensive sporting facilities in the area, including field sports and water-based activities; and
- the under-exploited amenity resource of the River Dodder.

Weaknesses:

- heavy traffic dividing the area, particularly heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) with associated problems of noise, fumes and danger;
- the scarcity of developable land to cater for any population growth in the area;
- the inaccessibility of a number of water bodies due to traffic arteries and dockside buildings;
- poor 'passive policing' of open spaces from peripheral vehicular routes and the absence of residential developments overlooking the main park with consequent security problems.

A small part of the study area adjoining the Grand Canal Dock is included in the Grand Canal Dock Planning Scheme 2000. This scheme sets a separate planning process for development and defines the parameters that particular development proposal must comply with in order to be approved. The plan proposes a number of environmental improvements on lands within the study area, and new cultural facilities at Grand Canal Square that will serve the residents of the study area.

What is striking is the extent to which the AAP limits itself to the physical aspects of the area. Indeed, this should not be surprising, as the objectives of the AAP are set out to be *"the enhancement of the Ringsend/Irishtown village centre as the centre for social and shopping activities for local communities, and the improvement of the River Dodder and its banks to provide a better amenity for local population"*, and the AAP itself acknowledges that *"most of the works involved will be physical in nature"* (ibid).

2.5 The Dublin Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework

Framework Content:

Our final discussion of the contextual factors that affect the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area is the Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework (DEGW 2002, 2003). The Framework was produced by DEGW Consultants for Dublin City Council in 2001, and has been adopted into the Dublin City Development Plan 2005.

The brief issued by the Council called for Urban Design and Land Use Studies in three specific areas in Dublin City; Heuston Station and Environs, City Markets Area and the Southbank Road Environs. All three areas were perceived to be either under particular pressure from current planning applications, or had a particular potential for regeneration. The Southbank area was subsequently redefined to include the Poolbeg Peninsula.

The Framework is essentially an urban design and long-term development framework. It outlines the drivers for change and the design framework to be used in the area. The report highlights the level of uncertainty over future strategic road development in the area. A 1999 NRA report recommended three road options to link the Port Tunnel and M50 via Poolbeg Peninsula.

For the Poolbeg Peninsula the report identifies three design frameworks: 'minimum intervention' as an International Ecological park; 'medium intervention' as a Coastal Amenity Park and 'maximum intervention' as a fully developed Civic Gateway.

The report sets out a 'Network of Amenity' supporting both city-wide and local needs, as well as recognising cultural and ecological functions in parallel with recreational and employment needs. The Amenity section of the plan highlights the opportunities for developing water-based sports facilities and the conversion into recreational use of some historic buildings.

The Plan envisages the development of around 3,750 residential units and 130,000 sq.m of commercial space. This would result in a population increase of around 9,750 people with over 7,000 people employed in the new commercial development. This would have impacts, both positive and negative, upon traffic flows and the use of recreational facilities.

The consultants recognise the challenge in developing a development framework which is posed by the contradicting short-term demands and long-term objectives of the plan which, to a certain extent, could be considered aspirational. An example of this is the suggestions that sites which are currently used for electricity generation could be converted into recreational or community uses in the long run.

Consultation Process:

The Southbank/Poolbeg Framework Plan was publicly displayed for one month in early 2005 and members of the public were invited to make submissions regarding the plan. In total, 165 submissions were received and a summary of the observations made and the responses of the city manager are contained in the Manager's Report (DCC 2005). The report provides an important insight into the views of residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area about the development of their area. With regard to each topic, the report first summarises a particular issue that has been mentioned in a number of submissions and then makes a formal response to the observations made.

In total, nineteen themes are examined in the Manager's Report, which documents, in an extraordinary way, the range of topics with which a community is being confronted and how people want to have a say in the way their area is being developed for the future. We are not able here to refer to all of the issues raised. We will, however, highlight some of the most pertinent issues, and particularly those which we also encountered in the course of our consultations with representatives of the communities.

- **47 Submissions** were received which in one way or another stated that no real **consultation with the local community** about the future of their area has ever taken place.
- **15 Submissions** were received with regard to **previous agreements on the use of Poolbeg Peninsula**. The source of these decisions is variously attributed to either the City Council or the Minister for Local Government. They generally concur that all land not required for essential port usage would remain as parkland and/or for recreational use in compensation for loss of beaches.
- **81 Submissions** were received with regard to **Movement and Transportation**, dealing with various aspects of road infrastructure, public transport and local traffic.
- **37 Submissions** were received with regard to **Lack of Public Transport**.
- **62 Submissions** were received with regard to **Environment and Ecology**, dealing with various aspects of potential disturbances to, and loss of, the area's wildlife and natural habitats.
- **16 Submissions** were received with regard to **Wastewater Infrastructure**, relating either to the plant's ability to cater for the additional development proposed in the plan, and the (mal)functioning of the existing treatment plant.
- **20 Submissions** were received with regard to the proposed **Thermal Treatment Plant**. These can be broken down under two headings: firstly, objections to the siting of the incinerator on the peninsula and, secondly, concerns that the framework plan does not refer to or deal adequately with the incinerator.

It must be recognised that the Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework was prepared in response to development pressures in the Southbank and Poolbeg areas and that the proposals contained within it relate to the principles that this new development should follow. The plan is not intended to establish a framework for the development of the communities that adjoin it; i.e. Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount. However, the submissions made by residents from these areas indicate that the local community have strong views on the overall direction of growth of their area and how it will impact upon their quality of life. These have to be taken as strong indication of what the interests of the communities are and will need to be taken into account when discussing 'community gain'.

3 The Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area

This chapter describes the area which is the subject of this study. We start with a brief geographical and historical profile of the area. This is followed by a discussion of the threats and opportunities which the three communities residing in the area currently face. The chapter finishes with highlighting the need to develop an Integrated Plan for the sustainable development of the area.

3.1 A Geographic and Historical Profile of the Catchment Area

Geographical Boundaries of Study Area:

The area, as defined for the purpose of this study, consists of the three communities most directly affected by the location of the proposed incinerator at Poolbeg Peninsula: Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount. No consideration is given to the possible impact of the proposed incinerator to the North of the Liffey, notably Fairview and Clontarf, nor is a wider effect on the whole of Dublin being considered here. The area is thus defined in the context of land-borne effects, rather than air-borne or sea-borne effects.

The area is located at the East of Dublin Inner City and bounded to the North by the River Liffey, the West by the Grand Canal Basin and the River Dodder; the South-West is defined by the Dart railway line, and the East is defined by the seashore of Dublin Bay. Because of its location, the area is rich in its natural amenities, including the sea, waterways and parklands. It lies on the Southbank of the River Liffey, stretching from the Grand Canal Basin and the bridge over the River Dodder out to the Poolbeg Lighthouse at the furthest extremity of the South Wall. To the South, it includes some of Dublin's most highly valued residential areas, which provide organically grown neighbourhoods of high residential value and integrity of its built fabric.

Population:

At least in comparison to other areas of Dublin, all three communities comprise a high proportion of residents that have lived there for considerable time. At least until now, there has been relatively little in-movement into the three areas, largely because of its low density but built-up character, which has allowed for relatively few infill developments. It is only now with the development of the docklands area, that the area is likely to see considerable change in this regard, starting with the high density developments around the Grand Canal Dock and considerable potential for high density infill on part of the Poolbeg Peninsula.

Indeed, the constraints on developing new housing, combined with particularly rapidly rising house prices due to the area's proximity to the City Centre, have led to a situation where many people who have grown up in the area find it impossible to secure housing within their area, never mind at a price they can afford. There is thus a considerable demand for new affordable housing within the area.

History and Culture:

Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount are on the eastern edge of Dublin at a scenic location on a spit of land bounded by the rivers Dodder and Liffey. The area was largely uninhabited until the early 17th century when a fishing village was established by the entrance to the Dodder. The name Ringsend is derived from the Irish 'Rinn' meaning spit or peninsula. The name Irishtown originates from those people of Irish descent who were ordered to live two miles outside of Dublin City by Cromwell in 1654. A port was developed soon after and the area's linkage with maritime activity commenced.

The port soon overtook Dalkey as Dublin's principal port with hotels, including the Pigeon House Hotel, catering for the needs of travellers. The Great South Wall, constructed to

provide additional protection for shipping, was constructed during the 18th century and in 1796 Grand Canal Harbour was opened. By the 19th century much employment in the area was in the industries of fishing, boat-building and glass-works.

Ringsend and Irishtown's role as a port declined over time as Dun Laoghaire's port became more prominent. Industrial uses continued in the area with chemical works, glass making and the opening of the Pigeon House electricity station in the 19th century. This station closed in 1976 after being replaced by the Poolbeg Station in 1965. The 20th century saw continued industrial use within the area, including a container facility, chemical works and glass and concrete manufacturing. Following reclamation of a municipal dump in the late 1970's the land area of Ringsend was increased and additional recreational facilities provided in the form of Sean Moore Park.

Originally brickfields, Sandymount became a fashionable place to live by the late 19th century with people coming to visit the beach, pier and hot and cold water baths. The area has retained its connection with seaside recreation; the Great South Wall being a popular place for recreation and a means for many people of attaining a different perspective on the city. Sandymount Strand is a popular place for recreation, particularly with the increasing quality of the seawater following the opening of the sewage treatment plant at Poolbeg.

The area remains an increasingly fashionable place to live with the price of housing reflecting the area's proximity to the city. This rise in prosperity is causing problems for the descendants of many people in the area who are no longer able to afford to live in the area in which they were raised. There remains a divide between the quality of the urban environment within the study area with Sandymount being one of the city's most desirable places to live and some parts of Ringsend and Irishtown in need of further regeneration.

Community Identity:

Partly as a result of the organically grown nature of the neighbourhoods which comprise the overall study area, the residents have a strong pride in their respective areas. It is not always clear where exactly Ringsend and Irishtown separate, and the community identity between these two communities somewhat melts into one another. However, there is a sharper separation between Ringsend/Irishtown on the one side and Sandymount on the other. The areas are hugely different in terms of their social composition and this will be dealt with in Chapter Seven of this study. Reflecting the differences in social composition and relative well-being or affluence, there are not only considerable differences between the perceived needs of the people living in Ringsend/Irishtown and Sandymount, but also long-standing rivalries between particular groups and families *within* each of the areas. These have also contributed to the fact that, despite several attempts over the past decade, it has not been possible so far to develop a cohesive plan for the area which attracts broad support by the people living within it.

3.2 Threats and Opportunities

Having outlined the larger development trends that affect the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, as well as briefly alluded to some of the area's strengths and weaknesses, we can now summarize the more general threats and opportunities facing the communities. The emphasis here is on understanding the more extensive threats and opportunities to inform our own approach to what will need to be considered in our approach to this study.

Threats:

- The area is affected by a number of large-scale development proposals and framework documents, each with a different focus and spatial remit, and none of which considers the combined effects on the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area.

- The proposals for redevelopment of certain sites within and adjacent to the area are largely private, with consequent pressures on residential amenity and quality of life for the existing population.
- The Poolbeg Peninsula has been named as the preferred location for the Dublin Waste to Energy Project which could have a major impact on the area.
- The peninsula is the location for significant port activity and industry such as electricity generation.
- The waste water treatment plant is proposed for expansion.
- No analysis in any comprehensive form has been undertaken to date as to what the needs of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities are.

Opportunities:

- Significant areas within and adjacent to Ringsend and Irishtown are subject to major development proposals (i.e. this constitutes both a threat and an opportunity).
- There is a growing awareness at various institutional levels that redevelopment must not be purely determined by private sector interests, but must also address the needs of the respective communities.
- There is considerable experience emerging within and outside Dublin City in the development of Integrated Plans, including how to assess a community's needs, how to build a community infrastructure that can express these needs and negotiate effectively with the institutions of the state and local government.
- The HGV Management Strategy is likely to bring about a major improvement of the traffic situation on the Southern Port access route.
- If the incinerator is built, Dublin City Council is committed to institute a Community Gain Fund of considerable size to benefit the residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area.

3.3 A Holistic Approach to the Development of Sustainable Communities

One of the criticisms which we detailed above is that none of the larger development plans or frameworks treat the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount areas in a holistic manner. Each plan has its own spatial remit and none is concerned with the combined effects of all of the plans on the areas in question. However, we also note that the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount areas are distinct entities and do not constitute a single homogeneous community. On the contrary, there exists a significant social divide within the area. The principal reason that the three communities are considered here together is that, if the incinerator is built, they will all be equally affected by it. They will also, in this event, equally benefit from the Community Gain Fund which Dublin City Council intends to institute in this event.

The three communities, nevertheless, do have some important communalities:

- they are all within Dublin City but outside the Inner City;
- they are in the same administrative region of Dublin City Council (Dublin South East);
- they all adjoin Dublin Bay;
- they share a history which is closely connected with Dublin port;
- they face similar threats in the wake of some of the larger development plans
- they may jointly benefit if a Community Gain Fund is being instituted.

4 The Dublin Waste to Energy Project

This chapter introduces some of the key aspects surrounding the proposed incinerator. Many of the specifications, such as its size, its technology, the expected emissions, the monitoring environment, the effect on traffic and many more have not yet been finally stated and will only become apparent when Dublin City Council and Elsam, the private company which has been selected to design, build and operate the facility, present their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to An Bord Pleanála. This is also the point at which the residents of the area, and indeed any other individual, can formally state their objections to the proposal.

As the proposed Community Gain Fund is directly related to, and dependent upon the granting of planning permission for the incinerator, it is necessary to document some of the questions which are of concern to the residents living in the immediately affected area. Furthermore, there are some important comments to be made about the process itself which are important not only with respect to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, but are of general importance as to how state and local authorities interact with individual communities and facilitate the building of consensus in the siting of major waste infrastructure projects. The discussion will take particular reference to the concerns raised by the Community Interest Group (CIG), the results of the MRBI Household Survey carried out in Spring 2006 and the issues raised in the course of the consultant's interviews of representatives of the three communities.

4.1 The Project

This section briefly outlines some of the key parameters of the Waste to Energy Project in a non-technical manner. Our intention here is **not** to enter into any detailed discussion of whether incineration forms an acceptable element of waste management or not. These issues will be dealt with in the Environmental Impact Statement and the oral hearing before An Bord Pleanála. The purpose here is to sketch out the range of issues which are controversial, where questions are being asked by residents of the affected areas, and thus need to be addressed as part of a meaningful consultation and process of consensus building.

Time Plan of Major Events to Date:

1997:	Project included in Dublin Regional Waste Management Strategy;
1999:	Feasibility and Siting Studies;
2000 - 2004:	Procurement Process through Dublin Waste to Energy Project consortium;
Spring 2006:	Appointment of Elsam to design, build and operate the incinerator;
Summer 2006:	Submission of EIS to An Bord Pleanála ; beginning of statutory process.

During 2001 and 2002, Dublin City Council undertook a major initiative to consult with the local communities. This process, and the group established towards this end, is known as the **Community Interest Group**. We will discuss this undertaking in some greater detail below.

Incineration as Part of the Regional Waste Management Strategy:

There is considerable debate as to whether incineration forms part of an ecologically sustainable waste management strategy or not. Clearly, the priority should be to reduce waste in the first instance and at least some would claim that the provision of incineration diverts from this objective. Nevertheless, most European countries include incineration into how they manage their waste, and most of the new regional waste management strategies developed in Ireland now foresee the building of an incinerator to reduce the extensive use of landfill that has been common throughout Ireland.

The majority of Ireland's population at this point in time sees the changes necessary to reduce a rapidly growing waste mountain as being too slow to avert having to choose between two bad alternatives: more landfill or some incineration. In such a scenario, an increasing share of the population views the extensive use of landfills as being less

acceptable than incineration. A nation-wide survey by ERM on the question “*Would you prefer your household waste to be incinerated or landfilled?*”, for example, reports 46 per cent in favour of incineration and 44 per cent in favour of landfill (Forfás 2001).

The *Dublin Regional Waste Management Plan* expresses the agreed views of the four Dublin Local Authorities, and thus has to be viewed as the legitimate expression of the people of the Dublin region.

It is interesting to note that even within the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area the attitude of residents to landfill and incineration (in general) are quite similar: 55 per cent of residents object against landfill and 61 per cent object against incineration in general. The level of objection obviously rises with regard to incineration within their own area, with 72 per cent of residents noting objection (MRBI Survey). The majority of the CIG was also not convinced of the principal necessity of incineration.

Size of Incinerator:

It is not yet known for which size Dublin City Council and Elsam will apply. The *Waste Management Plan 1998-2004* proposed a capacity in the region of 500,000 – 700,000 tonnes per annum. The *Waste Management Plan 2005-2010* mentions a capacity of between 400,000 – 600,000 tonnes per annum. It is assumed for the purposes of this report that the application to An Bord Pleanála will be at the high end of these ranges.

The size of the incinerator begs a number of important questions: (i) the larger the plant, the more emissions it will have from its chimney stacks and the greater will be the quantities of residual waste, (ii) the greater the plant, the more trucks will run to and from the facility, (iii) the proposed scale of the incinerator is likely to bind the region into a high level of incineration for the facility's life span. (iv) Following from this, the question arises whether it would be more appropriate to build two or three smaller incinerators in the Dublin region rather than one comparatively big one.

Location:

Dublin City Council initially considered ten locations for the incinerator, four of which were shortlisted for further consideration. Six criteria were applied for this assessment: (i) proximity to waste centre, (ii) road access, (iii) traffic, (iv) end-market use, (v) site size and current land use, and (vi) proximity to residential areas. The four sites which ranked as ‘more suitable’ in the preliminary analysis were then subject to a more detailed assessment of the six criteria, as well as general planning and environmental issues surrounding the sites. From this analysis, the four shortlisted sites appeared in the following order of preference: (i) Poolbeg, (ii) Robinhood (iii) Cherrywood, and (iv) Newlands, making Poolbeg the ‘preferred site’.

Throughout the consultation with community representatives, the consultants have encountered strong reservations with regard to the selection process: (i) The Poolbeg Peninsula is already heavily burdened with industry and lacks adequate infrastructure to cope with even the existing demands from these. (ii) Residents question the suitability of the ground on which the incinerator is proposed to be built. The ground is part of an earlier landfill which may be unsuitable for the type and size of facility being proposed. (iii) The CIG and other residents have raised serious questions about the sincerity with which other possible locations have been evaluated. Part of the statutory requirements for the pursuit of the plan is that the applicants have to have a ‘Plan B’; i.e. a plan that outlines possible other locations if this was to be rejected. In the CIG's view, the fact that no ‘Plan B’ has ever been produced indicates that no other location has ever been given serious consideration.

These concerns are likely to be raised in objections to the actual application process and will be addressed by An Bord Pleanála.

Health:

Possibly the most important consideration with regard to incineration in general, and incineration at the Poolbeg Peninsula in particular, are the possible health risks emanating from the proposed Waste to Energy facility. There are a lot of conflicting views and assertions with regard to the associated risks, an issue frequently raising tempers. Responding to these fears in an open and reasonable way forms an important element in building trust and mutual accommodation. If residents feel that their concerns are not being treated seriously, they will not trust the assurances given, independently of whether they are substantively right or wrong.

Health concerns voiced by the residents include, among others: (i) the amount of emissions released into the air, (ii) the long term effects of dioxins, (iii) the containment of fly ash, (iv) the safe disposal of the bottom ash, and (v) the pollution on account of the additional HGV traffic.

Dublin City Council has undertaken considerable steps to inform people about the incinerator, notably through the publication of fifteen Newsletters, eight information days and the formation of the Community Interest Group. However, our consultation with the community reveals that the information has largely been perceived as biased and that less than one third of residents (30%) feel that they know either a fair bit or a great deal about the incinerator (MRBI Survey). More poignantly, even after the extensive information campaign, 87 per cent of residents still feel either fairly or very concerned about the health effects of the proposed incinerator and 89 per cent feel fairly or very concerned about its effect on air quality (*ibid*). Similarly, the Community Interest Group states *"All in all, while the CIG have heard from some experts about the likely emissions from a waste to energy plant, they do not feel that what they have heard is either clear, or reassuring"* (Mercator, 2002a).

Environment:

Dublin Bay is acknowledged as a special amenity area, and parts of it are included under environmental designations as a candidate Special Area of Conservation, a proposed Natural Heritage Area and a Special Protection Area. The bay has been under threat from the urban environment and increasing industrial and economic activity for a considerable time. More recently, ongoing environmental improvements from the Dublin Bay Project and other initiatives have significantly improved water quality in the bay. There are genuine concerns amongst residents of the three communities that the incinerator will add significant levels of additional emissions into the air and discharges into the sea, with consequent implications for bird, animal and marine life all along the coast, as well as disimproving the environment for humans.

However, any potential negative impacts on the environment from the proposed Waste to Energy facility will have to be evaluated in the context of the wider plans for the area, such as, for example, the potential mitigation brought through district heating of new development in the vicinity of Poolbeg, or the long-term relocation of other non-port related industries from the peninsula.

Traffic:

Our final consideration of the proposed incinerator concerns the associated increase in traffic. Besides the possible negative effects on the environment and health, traffic has clearly emerged as one of the most important concerns amongst the residents of the three communities (MRBI Survey). Local roads, particularly Beach Road/Strand Road and Sean Moore Road, but also other secondary roads are already overstretched by the existing HGV traffic, as the roads have never been designed to cater for such loads. As the discussion about an Eastern port access route has been delayed indefinitely, this situation will not change in the foreseeable future. If the incinerator is being built, it will result in an addition of some HGV traffic in the area, exact estimates of which will be contained in the EIS.

As alluded to before, future levels of HGV traffic in the area will be much more affected by the way in which the HGV Management Strategy is implemented than the additional trucks associated with the Waste to Energy facility. Following Dublin City Council's latest decision on this matter, considerable benefits are likely to accrue to the area in this regard as of the beginning of 2007.

4.2 Consulting with the Community

It is not the purpose of this study to argue either for or against the incinerator. Dublin City Council has a duty to promote the project as it has been decided upon by the four Dublin Local Authorities. Equally, local residents have the right to object to the proposals being made and oppose these as they see fit. The central issue is that the decision at regional level to site an incinerator to service the population and businesses of the region, is vehemently opposed by the majority of residents of the communities where the incinerator is proposed to be located (MRBI Survey). Apart from the statutory right of every citizen to query the project after the formal planning application has been made to An Bord Pleanála, the key aspect of avoiding a conflict from arising is to engage with the communities most affected through a process of negotiation and consensus building. This section looks in some detail at how this task has been addressed to date.

The Dublin Waste to Energy Project:

Dublin City Council started its publicity campaign towards the end of 2001. The Council employed PR consultants and set up a dedicated entity to deal with all publicity aspects of the incinerator, the *Waste to Energy Project*. The Council also opened a regional office in Cambridge Street, Ringsend, to disseminate information about the project in the local area. Based on feedback from the Council, the office has increasingly become a resource for the local community to deal with a wider range of council-related issues. The *Waste to Energy Project* has published fifteen issues of *Waste Wise*, a series of large centre-folded coloured leaflets to inform local residents and held eight information days which provided the community with access to independent experts in the area of environmental health, traffic, air quality, ecology, planning, legal issues and traffic management.

Overall, the Council sees its role as one of awareness building and of giving as much detail as possible about the project in advance that would enable interested persons or groups to prepare for and participate in the statutory process when it starts. In doing so, the Council operates within the parameters that define the current policy environment.

However, based on feedback during our consultations, residents are little convinced by the information being given and the publications have done little to build trust between the Council and the local communities. As a whole, *Waste Wise* is perceived by the community as biased, in as much as it openly promotes the project with little space given to a fundamental objection to it. The overall tone of the publication and the information days is seen as one describing an inevitable process by which the incinerator will undoubtedly be built at the end.

Thus, questions need to be asked whether the overall strategy of Dublin City Council in terms of its engagement with the communities suffices. The process engaged in to date clearly shows that the communications have done little to resolve the underlying conflict and to achieve mutual accommodation. The situation is thus reminiscent of the findings of international studies on the siting of waste facilities which indicate that the process of facility siting tends to be most successful where the respective authorities enter into more wide ranging consultation and negotiation with the affected communities *in advance of the statutory process*. (c.f. Forfás, 2004, Lesbirel and Shaw, 2005, and NESC, 2005).

The Community Interest Group:

Besides the general publicity campaign, the most important – and to some extent innovative approach to communication – has been the setting up of the Community Interest Group (CIG). The CIG process arose from the Council's wish to engage with people within the community at a more serious level and thus provide a two-way path to communication. To quote from its concluding report:

"In October 2001 Dublin City Council convened a group of individual, voluntary members from the Ringsend and Sandymount area, and from other parts of Dublin, in order to discuss plans for a thermal treatment facility on the Poolbeg Peninsula. The principal aim of this process was to allow the group to gather information about thermal treatment, and about the impact a thermal treatment plant would have on the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount areas. This information would then be fed back to the wider community, so that as many people as possible would have some knowledge about what was planned for their area, and how it might affect their lives. This in turn would help people to prepare for the statutory phase of the project, during which they could present legal objections to the proposed plant, if deemed necessary" (Mercator Marketing Research, 2002b).

Throughout the process the CIG had access to a series of expert speakers on different aspects of waste disposal and incineration, in order to help them gather the necessary information. They also had access to legal advice and all costs of the CIG process were paid for by Dublin City Council.

There are a number of observations that need to be made with regard to the CIG process, and many of these are contained in the Group's own final report (Mercator Marketing Research, 2002a,2002b):

- Members of the CIG participated in their individual capacities; but were not representatives of the communities from which they came, nor did they ever claim to represent these communities.
- Members of the CIG at times encountered distrust from the wider communities, as their mere participation was viewed at least by some as succumbing to the inevitability of the outcome.
- There were fears both by members of the CIG and by people outside that process that the authorities will treat the CIG process as fulfilling their requirements to consult the public before granting a contract to design, build and operate a thermal treatment plant on the Poolbeg Peninsula.

Overall, the Summary Report concludes: *"Finally, even leaving these points aside, members of the group are very clear that very little in the way of consultation actually went on in the course of CIG sessions. Instead, they were provided with an overload of technical information, and a series of complicated briefings, rather than a proper opportunity to debate issues, reach conclusions, and offer meaningful feedback"* (ibid).

The CIG process was wound down at the end of 2002. A consultation in the true meaning of the word has not taken place, and it will remain to be seen whether the MRBI household survey carried out in Spring 2006 and this report itself constitute at least a real step in this direction.

The Environmental Impact Statement and the Statutory Planning Process:

The third element in what will be part of the consultation process is the statutory planning process. This comprises the formal process of Dublin City Council and Elsam, the private developers, applying to An Bord Pleanála for planning permission to construct the Waste to Energy facility.

The process centres around the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which sets out the details of the proposed plant and its possible impacts on the environment. Dublin City Council must publish a notice in a newspaper indicating that it intends to carry out the development and that submissions can be made to An Bord Pleanála during a specified period (not less than 6 weeks). It is likely that the Board will decide to hold an oral hearing on the proposed development. The Board can approve, approve subject to conditions, or refuse to approve the scheme, based on the consideration of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The Board shall also have regard to wider national and regional objectives, such as adopted national and regional waste management policy.

To operate a thermal treatment plant, a Waste License is also required from the Environmental Protection Agency. A separate oral hearing is likely to be carried out to address the environmental issues underlying the proposal.

In both planning and waste license proceedings, the public is presented with a formal proposal, which is examined in terms of its external impacts. However, the format of such proceedings is adversarial in nature and there is limited scope to address the underlying issues, other than the location and impacts of the particular proposal.

Whilst the statutory planning process is obviously a key element in ensuring that planned developments do not infringe on individuals' rights, they are an extremely limited means by which to reach an accommodation with regard to the wider issue involved: How can the interests of a wider population be reconciled with those of a particular community when they do not concur? This is the issue that An Bord Pleanála, among other bodies, has tried to address in imposing planning conditions requiring the formation of a Community Gain Fund to mitigate against some of the negative impacts on a community of a particular project.

5 Community Gain

“Contention surrounding the siting and management of waste infrastructure, particularly in relation to thermal treatment, is not unusual. A frequent concern raised by receiving communities is that, by hosting such facilities, which the wider population perceives as necessary, they experience a degree of disamenity on behalf of the wider population, yet they are not offered anything in return for this disamenity.” (Forfás, 2001)

Other countries such as the US, UK and Australia have devised systems of Community Gain, to create or enhance community support for such a facility. In *Waste Management – Changing our Ways* (DEHLG 1998) the Irish Government called, for the first time, for a similar approach to be developed in Ireland:

“New waste management facilities are generally unwelcome to the public and invariably generate vigorous local opposition. In part, this is a legacy of past poor performance, but even well designed and managed facilities can have implications for those who live nearby, whether in the form of visual disamenity, traffic volumes, concerns regarding property values, or otherwise. As a result, new developments, though considered essential in the wider public interest, routinely encounter vigorous legal and political challenges which put these projects at risk, cause delay and increase development costs. Good planning, careful site selection, public education and awareness and a policy of openness and transparency can mitigate such opposition. Local authorities, working closely with local communities, should utilise a proportion of income from waste charges and gate fees to mitigate the impact of such facilities on these communities through appropriate environmental improvement projects.” (DEHLG 1998).

Government policy with regard to the siting of major waste infrastructure projects developed further with the publication of *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* (Forfás, 2001). This report provides an in-depth review of the underlying rationale of community gain, a review of best international practise, and recommendations with regard to its implementation in Ireland. Because of its depth and importance, we will discuss the report in greater detail in Section 5.1., as well as including the full chapter dealing with use of Community Gain in the Appendix.

Some of the recommendations of *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* have since been given further weight. The *Agreed Programme for Government* (June 2002) states that the government “will develop further the concept of community gain in association with the delivery of major infrastructure proposals under the local authority waste management plans.” This is partly done in *Waste Management - Taking Stock and Moving Forward*, which states: “The concept of community gain recognises the reality that if Ireland is to deal with its waste in a modern, environmentally progressive way, new facilities have to be provided. It operates on the basis that the facilities will have to be located somewhere and that there should be a mechanism by which some benefit can accrue to the communities in the locations ultimately chosen.” (DEO&LG, 2004).

Unfortunately, *Taking Stock and Moving Forward* does not engage in any way in discussing the appropriate form of community gain, or the process by which it ought to be achieved. Nor has Government yet developed any criteria for the provision of community gain, as recommended in the Forfás report. The only statement contained in *Taking Stock and Moving Forward* is that some benefit shall accrue to the affected communities. It could therefore be argued that the only necessary requirement for a Community Gain Fund is that ‘some benefit’ accrue to the local community.

As pointed out by NESC (2005), international experience suggests that there are more effective approaches to conflict resolution than commonly adopted in Ireland. The effective search for environmental conflict resolution and consensus building requires a comprehensive understanding of Community Gain and the process by which this is to be negotiated. This chapter attempts to contribute to developing such understanding.

5.1 The Concept of Community Gain

The key aspect of 'community gain' is that it offers some form of compensation for alleviating the inequity and perceived losses incurred by a community when a proposed waste facility is planned for its locality. Internationally, 'community gain' has been implemented in one of three forms: 'community gain', 'planning gain' or 'host community benefits'. Whichever its precise form, key to it are **negotiated agreements** between the local communities affected and the developers, be they public or private, who will be in charge of the development of the facility.

Internationally, 'community gain' is most frequently associated with the improvement of facilities such as, for example, roads, schools, sporting facilities, concert halls, airports etc. Which facilities are being sought usually depends upon the particular needs and wishes of the community and tends to be negotiated in each specific case.

Closely related to the concept of community gain is the idea of 'planning gain'. Planning gain refers to planning conditions that the authority requests in response to granting permission for a development. Such practices are common in Australia and the UK. In Australia, the developer usually pays the local authority or relevant federal body money which is then used to purchase land in a region of high conservation value and thereby increase the size of the region's conservation land-bank. The UK experience has shown again that meaningful consultation has been essential in the successful siting of waste management facilities (Forfás 2001). In Irish practice, Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 allows for the levying of financial contributions on all new development granted planning permission within a planning authority. This can help to fund the provision of community facilities (as well as infrastructural works such as for roads, water and sewerage) in the functional area of the planning authority. Internationally, planning gain appears to be more common than community gain. An overview of the different types of planning gain practices is presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Different Forms of Planning Gain Employed Internationally

Regulation: Planning agreements may enhance the traditional regulatory role of development control in areas such as the restoration of land after mineral extraction, the phasing of development, and detailed control of future uses or environmental protection. Within this category however, the use of agreements may have broader social and economic objectives.

Physical Infrastructure: Agreements may ensure that roads, drainage, sewerage and land for improvements are provided by the applicant directly or by payment to the local authority, not only where these are necessary for the development to go ahead but also where it has an impact more generally on roads and sewerage systems or car parking.

Social Infrastructure: In Ireland and internationally, a wide range of social facilities, such as schools, crèches, community centres, public open space or rights of way may be provided by the applicant and, as with physical infrastructure, this may be either provided directly or by payment to the local authority. This again raises the problem of distinguishing those facilities that directly serve the proposed development and those facilities that relate to the wider needs of the community.

Broader Planning and Local Authority Objectives: In Ireland and internationally, agreements may seek more generally to implement the policies of the local authorities, especially those in development plans. Two key areas that have become increasingly important in recent years are the achievement of affordable housing and employment objectives such as training or jobs for local residents.

Source: Forfás (2001) Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland

In summary, we concur with the rationale provided in Forfás (2001) for 'community gain' as a means to achieving a negotiated agreement between local communities, local authorities and private developers:

- Community gain can facilitate and accelerate the development of waste management infrastructure required by all of society, while providing some form of equitable compensation for real or perceived negative impacts experienced by the hosting community.
- Community gain has been used successfully in other countries to create and increase community support for the development of new waste management facilities and to increase community involvement in the decision-making process surrounding the development of such facilities.
- National planning legislation is supportive of the concepts embodied in community gain, and such approaches could be accommodated within Ireland's existing legislative and policy framework, with minor amendments to existing legislation.
- Approaches similar to community gain have already been successfully employed in Ireland.

Source: Forfás (2001) Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland

We will return to the principles outlined above when discussing the proposed Poolbeg incinerator below.

5.2 Learning from Other Experiences in Ireland

Whilst we started with a discussion of 'community gain' as a compensatory element in the planning process, and again most specifically in the siting of waste facilities in Ireland and abroad, the concept has much broader application and is indeed already practised in a variety of forms in Ireland. These applications offer a broad spectrum of experience, which we will need to draw upon, if meaningfully implemented in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area.

The first one is in the context of disadvantaged communities and is principally aimed at addressing problems of cumulative disadvantage, arising from the clustering of high proportions of people, who are experiencing social exclusion within certain geographical locations. The second one is the setting up of Community Gain Funds (CGFs) in the context of tax incentive-driven urban renewal, to ensure that greater benefits accrue to the respective communities.

5.2.1 Special Programmes to Target Disadvantaged Communities

Limiting ourselves here to the consideration of urban disadvantage, CGFs presently exist in Ireland in the form of three Government or EU programmes: (i) the Local Development Social Inclusion Programme (LDSIP), (ii) the RAPID Programme (Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and development), and (iii) the EU URBAN initiative. None of the three programmes refers to the actual terms 'community gain' or 'community gain fund', but the nature of a set amount of money being allocated to a clearly defined geographical area to support initiatives aimed at the improvement of the social and community infrastructure are identical to the objectives of 'community gain' and 'planning' in all but their name.

The most important one is the LDSIP, which currently supports 33 area-based partnerships and 38 local community groups throughout the country. The Dublin Partnerships cover those communities which are well-known for their high degree of deprivation: Coolock/Darndale, Ballymun, Finglas/Cabra, Blanchardstown, Clondalkin, Crumlin/Kimmage/Walkinstown, Tallaght, Kilmainham/Inchicore/Cherry Orchard, and Dublin Inner City. The first Partnerships

were set up in 1991 under the *Programme for Economic and Social Progress* (PESP), primarily with the aim to combat the persistently high rates of long-term unemployment in these areas. However, since these early days, the programmatic remit of the area-based partnerships has become much wider, covering almost every aspect of social inclusion. The importance of the Partnerships and Community Groups supported under the LDSIP lies in that they provide by far the greatest pool of experience in how to assess the needs of local communities, develop local area action plans and set up the institutional frameworks to effectively deliver a programme to meet these needs. The success of the Partnerships in Ireland have acclaimed international recognition (Sabel, 1996) and a detailed review of their *raison d'être* and experience is provided in Haase & McKeown (2003). Ringsend and Irishtown form part of the Dublin Inner City Partnership (DICP) area, but Sandymount, as a relatively affluent area, is not included.

The RAPID programme is a focused initiative by the government to target the most disadvantaged urban areas and provincial towns in the country. It effectively came into existence from a desire to extend the lessons learned from successive local development programmes into the work of the local authorities. The 25 urban areas targeted by this programme are prioritised for investment and development in relation to health, education, housing, childcare and community facilities, including sports facilities, youth development, employment, drug misuse and policing. At local level, any individual household identified as in need of support will be able to avail of the services of a number of agencies at once, rather than the independent system of provision which is the norm. There are 14 RAPID areas within the Dublin region, all of which re-emphasise the most disadvantaged communities within the designated Partnership areas. Dublin's Inner City comprises 5 RAPID Areas: North West, North East, South, South West and South East. The South East Inner City area comprises Charlemont Street/Tom Kelly Road, Power's Court/Verschoyle, Leo Fitzgerald House, St. Andrews Court, and Macken Villa's. However, despite being immediately adjacent to this RAPID area and experiencing equal levels of deprivation, none of the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods of the Ringsend/Irishtown area were included in the RAPID designation.

URBAN is an EU funded Initiative. The Initiative focuses on generating innovative local strategies for sustainable development and developing better ways of tackling persistent problems and demonstrating that learning to others. Fifty communities in the EU have been selected to participate in the URBAN Initiative, and three locations have been selected under the programme in Ireland: two in Dublin city and one in Cork city. The importance of the URBAN initiative is that it could be understood as a 'hybrid' form of the Partnerships on the one hand and the RAPID programme on the other. URBAN builds on the Partnership experience in that the initiatives are constituted as limited companies with a clearly defined fund to be expended over a 5-year period. It is presided over by a Board representing the interests of key stakeholders, a structured way by which community representation is achieved at Board level, the development of a comprehensive Area Action Plan covering the 5-year period as a basis for its allocation of supports, and a designated complement of staff which manages the CGF on a day-to-day basis. Its leaning on RAPID includes its close relationship with the respective local authority, including the fact that the EU funds are drawn down by it. The local authority is also responsible for the monitoring of the expenditure. Because of the way the URBAN initiative is set up, and the similarity of scope of what may be achieved through such CGF, it is suggested that the Initiative provides a particular relevant example for what could be envisaged with regard to the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area.

5.2.2 CGFs in the Context of Integrated Area Plans

Urban renewal first became prominent in Ireland since the passing of the *Urban Renewal Act* (1986) during the mid 1980s. The Scheme was generally deemed successful albeit limited in its scope. As the evaluation report of the Scheme (KPMG 1996) concludes: *"in those designated areas which have adjacent indigenous inner-city communities, the local communities believe that urban renewal as defined by the incentive schemes, has not addressed issues which are central to the regeneration and sustainable re-development of*

those areas such as unemployment, the lack of public amenities, education, training and youth development” (ibid). The need for an integrated approach to renewal, subsequently translated into new *Guidelines for Integrated Area Plans* (DoE, 1997).

The challenges of integrated area planning are directly addressed in the Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2011 which recognises that there are areas of the Inner City with a local community identity: *“It is the policy of the Planning Authority to suggest and maintain the existing traditional Inner City communities and to seek to create a balanced development of physical infrastructure to serve these communities services and open space.”* During 1995 the northwest inner city area became a ‘major initiative’ under the EU Operational Programme resulting in the Historical Area Rejuvenation Plan (HARP). In 1996 the Government decided a strategic regeneration plan be developed for the Dublin Docklands area, resulting in a Master Plan and the Dublin Docklands Development Authority Act in 1997. The area between these two initiatives was recognised as being in need of integrated development and a Rejuvenation Project Plan was prepared by the Dublin Corporation in 1993 and a Draft Action Plan in 1997. (Corcoran 2003).

A new *Urban Renewal Act* became operative in 1998, which principally sought to foster urban regeneration by way of introducing tax incentives schemes which made generous provision for developers willing to develop derelict sites. To be included into the tax incentive scheme, local authorities were required to prepare Integrated Area Plans (IAP’s) for the areas in most need of physical and socio-economic rejuvenation. Dublin City Council responded by preparing IAP’s for five such areas: (i) North East Inner City, (ii) O’Connell Street, (iii) Kilmainham/Inchicore, (iv) Liberties/Coombe, and (v) HARP. All five areas were subsequently designated under the Act.

The residents of the designated areas are expected to benefit from the IAP in terms of enhanced economic opportunity, better quality environment and housing, and community and social benefits. Each IAP has a Monitoring Committee which is chaired by a Dublin City Councillor and is expected to meet several times a year to review the progress on the IAP. Most importantly for the context of this study, each IAP operates a Community Gain Fund (CGF) as its main means by which to fund those aspects of the plan which are not an element of the private developer-led initiatives. Experiences from the IAPs in general, and from their implementation of the CGFs in particular thus have to be an important cornerstone when considering the setting up of a CGF for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area.

Unfortunately, the IAPs and particularly the CGFs operated by them have been beset with problems from the time of their inception: The Monitoring Committee members frequently have difficulties with their role. By their nature, the Committees are monitoring the progress of the IAP and thus have only an advisory role and often feel powerless to affect any real decisions (Corcoran 2003). Even more problematic has turned out to be the effective representation of the communities’ wishes through the Monitoring Committees and the question arises whether the Committees are the appropriate forum for meaningful community participation in the implementation of IAPs at all (SWICN 2001). Other criticisms from the community perspective include the lack of strategic linkages to other forums of community representation (such as the Inner City Partnership) and a city-wide forum of community representatives to enable them to develop more strategic community representation.

Criticisms with regard to the operation of Community Gain Funds in the IAPs have been even stronger. There is a lack of clarity about the concept of ‘Community Gain’ and the areas which such gain should encompass. The community representatives take particular objection to an *“unacceptable narrow and paternalistic concept of Community gain” (ibid).* Communities have real and legitimate needs, and it is these needs, as perceived by the communities in their relative importance, which have to determine the parameters of the ‘Community Gain’ agenda.

The SWICN (2001) report then outlines further the key elements of how to achieve ‘Community Gain’. These include: (i) the identification of all objectives as outlined in a comprehensive Area Action Plan, (ii) a comprehensive consultation process with all of the

tenants/residents groups and community organisations in the area, (iii) the development of indicators to evaluate the degree of success or failure of the implementation of the Area Action Plan and the specific objectives with regard to 'Community Gains', and (iv) the right of the communities to review and restate their objectives in accordance with changes in the external environment (*ibid*).

The commissioning of the present study presents a unique opportunity to learn from these lessons and to maximise the benefits that may accrue to the communities of Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, if a Community Gain Fund is set up in the context of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project.

5.3 Identifying Possible Impacts

Having reviewed the larger developments which affect the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, the threats and opportunities which the area face, the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, the process of consultation, and the underlying rationale and principles of 'community gain', we can now start to address what actually needs to be the subject and scope of true consultation and negotiation between the City Council, developers and the local communities.

Our starting point has to be a clear statement of the possible impacts of the proposed incinerator and its real and perceived disbenefits for the communities, a statement of the needs and wishes of the communities if they were to consider a compensation, and a mutual recognition by Dublin City Council, the private developers and the communities of the scope of issues which will be consulted and ultimately negotiated.

5.3.1 Possible Impacts

It is beyond the scope of this study to consider all of the possible impacts which the Dublin Waste to Energy Project might have on the surrounding communities and population. We thus concentrate on some of the most pertinent ones mentioned in the literature, as well as referring to the particular concerns voiced by the Community Interest Group and during our consultation with community representatives in the area.

The first, and by far most important set of issues, are with respect to the proposed incinerator's impact on health, including: (i) fear about concentrations of dioxins (ii) concerns about how emissions will be monitored and (iii) what dangers arise from the residual waste?

A second set of issues may be described as economic impacts, which may both be positive or negative and are particularly sensitive to the time horizon over which they are being considered. Possible economic impacts include: (i) job creation during construction and operation of the facility, and (ii) heat and electricity generated and reused. Possible negative effects include: (iii) a loss in the amenity value of the area, (iv) locking the area into further industrial land use and (v) congestion costs arising from additional HGV traffic.

A third set of issues may be described as social impacts as a proposed or existing incineration facility can affect the area's social fabric. Negative social impacts include: (i) the possible factionalisation of the community, and (ii) impacts related to the real or perceived harm to the 'quality of life' in the vicinity of the waste facility. On the positive side, the community may experience a major benefit from the implementation of Community Gain. Finally, and also possibly falling under the theme of social impact, is the relationship between the communities, the respective authorities and the private developer of the incinerator. Whether this will be a positive or negative effect will depend on the openness of the consultation and negotiation entered into.

5.4 Defining the Scope of Consultation and Negotiation

Having considered the scope of the statutory planning process, the principal objectives of community and planning gain, the experiences in Ireland and abroad and the possible impacts of the proposed incinerator, we can now start defining the scope of the consultation and negotiation that should take place.

To date, the approach of Dublin City Council to the implementation of Community Gain can entirely be described by two main axes: Firstly, its approach to the community has been one of awareness building and the giving of as much detail as possible about the Waste to Energy Project in advance that would enable interested persons or groups to prepare for and participate in the statutory process when it starts. Secondly, Community Gain is entirely understood in terms of the setting up of a (monetary) Community Gain Fund to fund specific community facilities or projects. No consideration has been given to what might constitute a proportionate or appropriate benefit to the community, as it is expected that the amount to be made available for the Community Gain Fund will be decided by An Bord Pleanála, nor has the Council given any consideration to other issues which are important to the three communities and where Community Gain could meaningfully have been implemented. In summary, the Council's approach could be characterised by the sole requirement stated in *Taking Stock and Moving Forward* that '*some benefit can accrue to the communities in the locations ultimately chosen*'.

Whilst the Council's approach fully complies with current statutory requirements and indeed, reflects common policy practise in the siting of major waste infrastructure projects in Ireland, it is equally clear that additional *consultation and negotiation* with the affected communities would be required to meet international experience of best practise and the framework put forward in *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* (Forfás, 2001). Furthermore, and based on the extensive community consultation, it is the consultants' considered opinion that the proposed Community Gain Fund, if taken on its own, is unlikely to have the support of the full community, without it being considered in the context of the wider issues affecting the community, which extend beyond the proposed incinerator.

If the overall approach to the siting of the Dublin Waste to Energy Facility had been one based on conflict avoidance and consensus building, the most pertinent issues which would have needed to be dealt with as part of an actual process of consultation and negotiation would have to include the following:

- the size of the plant, and possibly the question of whether a number of smaller waste facilities across the Dublin region is preferable;
- key aspects of the proposed incinerator's technology to satisfy that the environmentally least harmful methods of incineration are being used;
- whether the plant should be in public, private, or joint ownership;
- key aspects of the monitoring environment such as to satisfy that independent monitoring takes place on-site and off-site, that the community can be satisfied that they will be well informed about the monitoring results at any point in time and that they can have trust in the overall monitoring process;
- agreement on the effects of the proposed facility on health, economic well-being, quality of life and the social fabric.

As the situation is now, these questions will be addressed as part of the EIS and the statutory process. This is an entirely unsatisfactory situation, as the statutory process is an adversarial process and not designed to foster mutual accommodation.

The principal ameliorating element on offer for the community as part of the proposed Waste to Energy facility is the prospect of a Community Gain Fund which will accrue some benefit for the communities most affected. But even here, because of the narrow definition of Community Gain, the initiative is likely to be incapable of meeting what the communities express as their most serious concerns.

As stated before, the three communities have not been able in the past to develop an Integrated Plan for their area, in which process they might have developed a shared vision for the future development of their area, and formulate their needs and aspirations as to how to get there. Nevertheless, our knowledge from the MRBI survey, the interviews held as part of this study, and particularly the submissions made by residents with respect to the *Southbank/Poolbeg Strategic Development Framework* does provide some insight into this question. In addition to the immediate concerns relating to the proposed Waste to Energy facility, the following aspects can be identified to be of key interest to the residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities:

- What is the overall land use strategy for the Poolbeg Peninsula, notably the level of industrialisation in the long run and a commitment to phase out any industries which are not port-related?
- What steps are undertaken to ensure the effective environmental conservation of Dublin Bay?
- What benefits will derive for the three communities from the re-development of the Docklands?
- How will the overall traffic and transport situation be improved in the area?
- How will the overall quality of life be improved in the three communities?
- What are the benefits that may accrue to the community from the Community Gain Fund, if the Dublin Waste to Energy Project gets planning permission?
- What structures will be in place for a more effective representation of the communities and their interests vis-à-vis Dublin City Council, Government departments and state agencies?

Summarising the key aspirations of the communities, and in line with a very strong sentiment brought to us in the course of the interviews with representatives of the residents organisations and other key stakeholders in the community, the emphasis is much stronger on the aspects of the wider planning of the area than on 'community gain' and particularly a narrowly focused Community Gain Fund. There is a strong perception within the three communities that their interests have long been neglected by Dublin City Council and that the Waste to Energy facility is only the most recent in a line of major infrastructural works in the area.

Most of the key issues listed above are outside the confines of the Community Gain Fund as proposed by Dublin City Council, and as is likely to be imposed by An Bord Pleanála, should the facility be permitted. However, the Community Gain Fund is only likely to be acceptable to the communities if it is part of a wider agreement to address those issues of concern. Such an approach would move towards consensus and a mutual accommodation of the interests of the wider community and those which will be most affected by the location of the Waste to Energy facility. Current Government policy enshrines the concept of Community Gain into its waste management policy; it does not state that the benefits to the community ought to be exclusively achieved through a Community Gain Fund. Indeed, earlier and more comprehensive policy statements by Government on environmental policy clearly support a wider approach to Community Gain, and the NESC only recently re-iterated the call to review the current Irish approach to waste facility siting in the context of best international practise. Thus, even at this point in time, the opportunity exists to put a process in place, alongside the proposed Community Gain Fund, that can address the wider social and community needs of the area and thus integrate the recreational and amenity needs into a wider plan.

6 The Community Gain Fund

The previous section highlighted that a Community Gain Fund is only one particular element in the wider array of community gain and planning gain. It also stated that the size of the fund itself ought to be subject to negotiation with the communities affected, rather than left for An Bord Pleanála to decide. This notwithstanding, the Community Gain Fund is an important means by which to incur some benefit to the communities most affected by the proposed Waste to Energy Facility. It also is the key focus of this study. This chapter therefore discusses how a Community Gain Fund might best be operated to maximise its benefit to the communities.

6.1 Organisational Considerations

Legal Status

Section 5.2 discussed in some detail the experiences in Ireland with various initiatives aimed at improving the well-being of specific communities, including the local area Partnerships and Community Groups supported under the Local Development Social Inclusion Programme, the five Dublin communities targeted under the Urban Renewal Scheme and the Ballyfermot URBAN initiative.

There is a wide consensus amongst those involved in local development initiatives that the setting up of local area-based initiatives as independent legal entities with limited company status has served the sector well. It allows communities to have ownership of the entities entrusted with the planning for their area, combined with clear structures of accountability (c.f. Sabel, 1996).

Composition of Board, Members and Working Groups

Whenever such initiatives have been set up in the past, there have usually been considerable discussions about the appropriate composition of its Board, and notably the question of the appropriate number of community representatives on it (c.f. Craig 1994 and Walsh et al, 1998).

Critically, the composition of the Board to oversee the spending of the Community Gain Fund should not be determined either by Dublin City Council or An Bord Pleanála, but be itself the outcome of consultation and negotiation of the parties involved and there are only broad guidelines as to which agencies should possibly be invited to participate. Generally, the composition should not be unduly influenced by who is contributing to the fund. The key is that the fund has to incur a benefit to the community, and the extent of benefit perceived will crucially be influenced by the sense of ownership by the communities.

In this context, we would like to make some comments on two recent decisions by An Bord Pleanála in the context of the Carranstown (An Bord Pleanála, Ref. PL.17.126307) and Ringaskiddy (An Bord Pleanála, Ref. PL04.131196) incinerators. Conditions Nos. 5 and 6 of An Bord Pleanála's Order to grant permission for the Ringaskiddy waste incinerator reads:

5. A Community Liaison Committee shall be established consisting of a minimum of eight representatives (two officials from the planning authority, two representatives for the developer, two local residents and two elected members of Cork County Council). The composition of the committee shall be subject to the agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To provide for on-going review of waste recovery/disposal in conjunction with the local community.

6. The developer shall pay to the planning authority an annual contribution of €1.27 (one euro and twenty-seven cent) per tonne of waste thermally treated at the facility towards the cost of the provision of environmental improvement and recreational or community amenities in the

locality. The identification of such projects shall be decided by the planning authority having consulted with the local liaison committee as provided for in condition number 5 above.

Reason: It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the cost of environmental, recreational or community amenities which will help mitigate the impact of the waste treatment facility on the local community in accordance with Government Policy as set out in "Changing Our Ways" (An Bord Pleanála, Case 131196).

While Condition 5 entails a clear reasoning in as much as that the suggested composition of the Community Liaison Committee reflects the purpose stated; i.e. the "*on-going review of waste recovery/disposal*", the same cannot be said in relation to Condition 6.

We concur with the vision set out in *Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland* (Forfás, 2001), whereby the scope of any planning and community gain as a means to developing a consensus approach and mutual facilitation should be the outcome of negotiations between the local authority and the developers on the one side, and the community affected on the other. Condition 6, in contrast, has an inbuilt circularity which is difficult to comprehend: Firstly, Dublin City Council and the developers of the incinerator are joint applicants for the waste facility and therefore constitute a single entity. Secondly, it is not the developer who ultimately pays the contribution as he will put the costs back onto the price of accepting the waste for incineration. As all waste burnt will be municipal waste, it is Dublin City Council which pays in the first instance, and ultimately the population of the Dublin Region through their payments for waste collection. Stipulating that the expenditure of the funds should then be "*decided by the planning authority*", even if in consultation with the community, appears to be a small gain for the community affected by the proposed incinerator, particularly before a background where there has been no true consultation or negotiation in the run-up to the statutory process. The proper approach would be that the community has a reasonable degree of autonomy about how the Community Gain Fund is put to best use *in consultation with the planning authority*. The role of the planning authority would effectively be to administer the payments and to ensure that the expenditure complies with criteria set out by Government for the operation of Community Gain, though such guidelines have yet to be developed.

Throughout this report, we have argued that the most pertinent aspect of community gain potentially lies with planning gain. Even within the confines of the Community Gain Fund, considerable planning gain can still be achieved if the administration of the Community Gain Fund creates the necessary structures which allows the three communities to be better represented vis-à-vis Dublin City Council and key Government departments and state agencies. Building on the extensive experience of local development initiatives in Ireland, this is best achieved if the relevant Government departments and state agencies participate at the highest level and thus be represented on the Board (c.f. Craig 1994 and Walsh et al, 1998) and a real Partnership approach be adopted in the long-term development of the area.

Achieving Community Representation

After the question of the composition of the Board which will oversee the Community Gain Fund, the next question is how a true community representation might best be achieved. This is a difficult question and one that has led to considerable debate throughout successive local development programmes in Ireland over the past decade and-a-half. There is no absolute standard that has emerged from this debate and there will always remain a degree of arbitrariness about it. What is of importance, however, is that the outcome in terms of the community representatives elected instils confidence in the wider community, and the ability of the members chosen to develop a consensus approach across the variety of interests which prevail within the communities affected.

The question is a particularly difficult one in the case of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities. Not only is the overall area made up of a number of distinct communities which also comprise very different social compositions, but there also exists a

history of these communities having failed to bring together an umbrella organisation which can represent the interests of the community *vis-à-vis* the functional organisations of the state and local authority.

The best way to address this problem that has emerged from this debate is one of agreeing first about a process, rather than directly discussing the outcome. To this end, we suggest to pursue a path similar to that employed by the Ballyfermot URBAN initiative, principally involving:

- (i) the holding of one or more public meetings to publicise the setting up of the Community Gain Fund;
- (ii) the invitation for people to nominate persons (or themselves) as possible candidates for election;
- (iii) the compilation and publication of a list of nominations received;
- (iv) the holding of one or more public meetings at which a secret ballot will be held to elect the community representatives.

The Operation of the Community Gain Fund

Based on the experience of the area-based initiatives under successive local development programmes (Craig 1994, Walsh *et al.* 1998, Haase *et al.* 1996 and 2003) and the URBAN and RAPID initiatives, the key issues that need to be addressed appear as follows:

- (i) As a first step, the Board will have to clarify the **Objectives of the Initiative**. Particularly in the absence of any Government guidelines on the operation of initiatives instituted to deliver Community Gain, it will fall to the Board to define the scope of what benefits it believes to be possible to deliver to the communities.
- (ii) The second most important step will be to develop a **Shared Vision** for what the initiative aims to achieve. This involves not only the development of a shared understanding of the various priorities between the different community interests, but notably a shared vision between the community representatives and the representatives of the Government departments and local authority.
- (iii) A critical element in expressing this shared vision is the development of an **Integrated Plan** for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. This study provides some of the background material to the development of such plan, including a detailed audit of the social & economic make-up of the area, and an extensive physical audit of the existing community infrastructure.
- (iv) The fourth step involves the **Clarification of Resources** for the initiative. In the immediate sense, these are defined by the size of the Community Gain Fund, as well as the timing at which resources will become available. However, major additional benefit could accrue to the communities if the Community Gain Fund was to be used to lever further commitment by other Government departments towards the community. This will notably apply to educational initiatives (e.g. aimed at addressing educational disadvantage), health initiatives (e.g. improvement of primary health care facilities, care for the elderly and drug treatment programmes) or other initiatives aimed at family well-being (e.g. improved provision of childcare).
- (v) One important issue that has consistently appeared as a problem in local development initiatives is the **Training of the Community Representatives**. Unlike the other Board members, the community representatives tend to lack the experience of how to best present the community interests to the statutory sector.
- (vi) To enable the initiative to properly disburse the Community Gain Fund and achieve the greatest possible impact with regard to its overall objectives, the day-to-day operation needs to be properly resourced through the **provision of an office and adequate complement of full-time and part-time staff**.
- (vii) Finally, structures will need to be put in place by which the initiative **Reports back to the Wider Community**. This is likely to involve the regular publication of information material, the organisation of public meetings, and the publication of Annual Reports which have become a common feature to all existing local development initiatives.

6.2 Developing a Shared Vision of Community Needs and Aspirations

As part of its role in identifying priority projects for the communities, the initiative should take a lead role in developing a shared vision of the communities' wider needs and aspirations. Again based on the wide experience that exists in Ireland in this regard, this is best done through the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the development of the local area. To avoid confusion with existing Area Action Plans for the local Partnerships and Integrated Area Plans under the Urban Renewal Act, we will call this plan the '*Integrated Plan*'.

Developing an 'Integrated Plan'

The first step towards developing an Integrated Plan will comprise taking account of the existing community infrastructure, comparing it to what the communities aspire to and what might be reasonably expected by comparison with other communities, as well as identifying particular gaps within the existing community infrastructure. This report has effectively been commissioned by Dublin City Council to facilitate this process.

However, whilst this report contains important background material towards the development of such plan, it cannot claim to be a substitute for it. The key element of the development of the Integrated Plan is that it requires a process of consensus building both within the respective communities, as well as between the communities and the statutory agencies and Government departments. Based on past experience, this is a process which requires considerable time and which cannot be substituted through the involvement of an external consultant alone.

Secondly, one of the key findings of the work undertaken by the consultants, in the course of the present study, is that the issues most at the heart of the three communities concerned involve the wider threats and opportunities which they experience and are thus outside the scope of the Community Gain Fund as currently proposed by Dublin City Council. This finding cannot be simply brushed aside. The success or failure of the Community Gain Fund, if instituted, will crucially depend on whether and how consideration will be given to these wider issues and thus need to be negotiated between the communities and the representatives of Dublin City Council and other statutory agencies.

Safeguarding Additionality

The final points in our elaboration about the possible structures to be set up to disburse the Community Gain Fund involve two specific issues which have repeatedly necessitated attention in the past: the safeguarding of additionality of the fund and the future monitoring and evaluation of the success or failure of the initiative.

To incur a real benefit to the communities, it is of utmost importance that the Community Gain Fund is not being used for what the communities could otherwise reasonably expect to happen anyway.

This question will be of particular importance in the case of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount areas. As is readily known, and shown in greater detail in Chapter 7, the three communities differ greatly in their degree of affluence. While Sandymount is one of the most sought-after residential areas in the whole of Dublin, Ringsend and Irishtown comprise some neighbourhoods which are amongst the most deprived in the city. To improve the overall living conditions, it is thus reasonable that some expenditure be used to address the relative deprivation of these residents and to achieve greater social inclusion which, ultimately, will also benefit the community as a whole. There is a wealth of experience with such projects and good initiatives towards this end have been established in practically all deprived communities throughout Dublin and indeed Ireland as a whole.

At the same time, the objectives and purpose of the proposed Community Gain Fund in the context of the siting of a major waste infrastructure are different to those of the Local

Development and Social Inclusion Programme or the Urban Renewal Act. Therefore, the benefits have to accrue to all residents that are affected by the location of the Waste to Energy facility and thus have to be at least partially balanced across the different needs of the different constituent communities. Considerable care will be taken in the last chapter of this study where we will develop an indicative picture of the use to which the Community Gain Fund might be put.

Finally, it will be important that, as the area expands its residential and commercial base mainly through the development of the docklands area, the new developments provide an extent and quality of supporting facilities that maintains the additionality of the Community Gain Fund in its own right.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The final consideration must be given to the question at a later stage of whether the proposed Community Gain Fund, if instituted, has achieved its overall aims and objectives. There are a number of points which are important to make in this regard.

It is only if and when a community has formulated its own views of what it aspires and wants to achieve in the form of a shared Integrated Plan that it is possible at a later stage to measure any achievements against the objectives set out in this Plan.

To this end, it will be of utmost importance to agree indicators against which any community gain or planning gain might be measured over time, as well as establishing baseline data as reference for the future. Depending on the objectives identified in the Plan, such indicators may be defined in terms of the provision of particular community facilities and infrastructure as, for example, the number of services and facilities for young people, older people or people with special needs etc. Other indicators may relate to the wider aspiration of the communities. Based on the research undertaken for this study, such indicators could, for example, include the overall level of HGV traffic, the overall levels of air, sea and land-based pollution, the extent of industrial activity and number of industries in the area, a 'pollution rating' of industries within the area, and the availability of affordable housing.

If and when such monitoring and evaluation takes place and shows that the initiatives have made real progress on the issues which are fundamental to the local communities, then trust will develop and there will be less of a difficulty for the siting of major waste facilities which the population as a whole needs, but nobody wants in their vicinity.

7 A Social and Community Audit of the Catchment Area

This chapter contains the findings from an analysis of key socio-economic data from the 2002 Census of Population, the physical audit of the existing community facilities and infrastructure, and some of the key findings of the MRBI survey with regard to the most important shortcomings in community infrastructure as perceived by the residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. In each case, we first present the data in considerable detail, followed by a discussion as to how the observations contribute to the overall assessment of the areas'/communities' strengths and weaknesses, the identified shortcomings and ultimately recommendations as to how these may best be addressed in the context of a community Gain Fund, if such was instituted in the context of the proposed Waste to Energy facility at the Poolbeg peninsula.

7.1 Socio-economic Profile of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area

Definition of the Study Area

- The study area consists of 4 Electoral Divisions (EDs) which, in turn, comprise 21 Enumerative Areas (EAs).
- Unfortunately, neither the EAs, and particularly not the EDs can be grouped in such a way as to provide data for the actual communities of Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount. Map 1 shows the delineation of the EAs and the naming convention for the purpose of this study.
- Broadly speaking, Ringsend is bounded to the East by the Grand Canal Dock, to the South by Bath Street and Londonbridge Road, to the West by Ringsend Park, and to the North by the Liffey. It thus comprises most of Pembroke West A (EAs: PWA 1,2,3,4) and most of Pembroke East A (EAs: PEA 1,2,3,4,5)
- Irishtown lies between Ringsend and Sandymount and also includes the Poolbeg Peninsula. In terms of area units it comprises small parts of Pembroke West A (PWA 5), Pembroke East A (PEA 6) and Pembroke East B (EAs: PEB 2).
- Sandymount lies South of Lansdowne Village and comprises the rest of the study area, between the seafront and the Dart line.
- Finally, our data includes a small area of Lansdowne Village to the South-West of the Dart line which is not included in the study area, but can not be taken out of the statistical analysis as the ED (Pembroke West A) and EAs straddle the railway line.

Overall Affluence and Deprivation (Table A7.1)

- As a whole, the area is well above the average on the affluence to disadvantage spectrum, with a score of 10.2 in 2002 on a scale of -50 (most deprived) to +50 (most affluent) and Ireland as a whole equal to zero.
- However, the area clearly comprises very different constituent parts, whereby Ringsend and Irishtown are made up of EAs which range from just marginally above the average to quite high levels of deprivation. Sandymount, in contrast, is in its entirety situated in the very affluent spectrum (see Map 2).
- In terms of change over the past eleven years, the overall score for the study area improved by 15.4 points, which is exactly equal to the change for Ireland as a whole; i.e. the overall study area has neither seen an improvement, nor a deterioration in terms of its relative positioning within the spectrum of affluence to deprivation.

- It is, however, of interest to see that in relative terms, improvements over the past eleven years for Ringsend and Irishtown (as measured by the combined EDs of Pembroke West A and Pembroke East A) have improved by a greater margin of nearly 22 points, compared to Sandymount, which has improved by a margin of about nine points.

Demographics (Table A7.2 and Table A7.3)

- Population wise, the area is untypical of recent national trends, as population levels increased by less than one per cent in the 1991 to 2002 period, keeping the population at a steady 15,000. It is, however, more representative of the growth rates for Dublin, which grew by 4.9 per cent over the same period and Dublin City, which grew by 3.6 per cent.
- The age dependency rate (the proportion of people under 15 and over 64 years of age as part of the total population) is 21 per cent, exactly equal to Dublin as a whole, but lower than that pertaining for Dublin City (29.1%). Whilst the age dependency for Sandymount has remained more or less constant around 30 per cent between 1991 and 2002, the rates for Ringsend and Irishtown have improved by about six percentage points from their early 30s in 1991 to about 26 per cent in 2002 (Maps 3 and 4).
- Lone parenthood in the area has increased significantly from 14.5 to 21 per cent; i.e. every fifth family with at least one dependent child is headed by a single parent. However, the rates are almost identical to their Dublin equivalence (14.8% in 1991 and 21.1% in 2002). It is unclear, to what extent this is the result from more young people becoming single parents in the area, or whether this is the result from public housing policy, as single parents have a high priority on public housing allocations and thus become concentrated in such areas.
- The latter point becomes pertinent in terms of Ringsend (Pembroke East A) where every third family with dependent children is now headed by a lone parent (34.6%) and the area around Thorncastle Street, where this applies to every second such family (53.5%) (see Map 5).

Labour Market (Table A7.4)

- Unemployment levels in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area have significantly improved over the past eleven years. Male unemployment has more than halved from 18.2 per cent in 1991 to 7.6 per cent in 2002 (compared to 19.7% and 9.3% respectively for Dublin and 24.7% and 11.8% for Dublin City). Female unemployment dropped from 12.4 to 5.7 per cent, compared to 14.9 and 7.6 per cent for Dublin and 17.4% and 8.7% for Dublin City. Unemployment rates in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area are thus below those for Dublin and Dublin City in general.
- Like the other indicators, however, there exists a huge variation within the overall area with unemployment rates in their mid-teens – i.e. twice the rates pertaining for the area as a whole – in most of Ringsend. In the Thorncastle Street area, exactly one in five persons is unemployed.

Social Class (Table A7.5)

- Social class characteristics in the Ringsend and Irishtown Area are significantly skewed towards the two poorest classes. In 1991, about one quarter of the adult population (26.1%) in Pembroke West A and nearly half of Pembroke East A (46%) was amongst the unskilled and semi-skilled classes. This proportion dropped to 15.0 and 32.2 per cent respectively in 2002, reflecting the general trend of reduction in the lower classes over time. Concentrations particularly in Pembroke East A thus remain considerably higher than to those pertaining for Dublin City (29.3% in 1991 and 15.8% in 2002) and even more so than Dublin as a whole (23.5% in 1991 and 16.2% in 2002).

- Again the Thorncastle Street Area and Stella Gardens appear as the most deprived areas with 43.1 per cent and 40.4 per cent in unskilled and semi-skilled manual professions in 2002, more than twice the national average of 20.2 per cent. The Higher and Lower Professional Classes account for only one in ten (9.9%) in the Thorncastle Street area and 15.2 per cent in Stella Gardens, about one quarter of the proportion which they account for in Dublin as a whole (35.7%).
- On the other side, the presence of the higher and lower professional classes remains below average within the Ringsend and Irishtown area. Although the proportion increased by about 16 and 11 percentage points in the eleven year time span (from 24.1% in 1991 to 40.9% in Pembroke West A in 2002 and 9.3% to 20.5% in Pembroke East A), the increase is actually below its general trend (from 28.5% to 35.7% in Dublin and from 25.2% to 31.6% nationwide).
- Sandymount, on the other hand, is one of the most affluent areas of Dublin and Ireland as a whole. In Sandymount North (Pembroke East B), 53.4 per cent of the population are made up of the Higher and Lower Professional Classes. In Sandymount South (Pembroke East C) this proportion rises to over 60 per cent (60.6%) in 2002.

Education (Table A7.6)

- The last table shows the highest level of education attained by the adult population. We would like to draw attention to the fact that all education data presented here refers to the characteristics of the adult population of the respective areas; i.e. those aged 16 and over. The Census of Population does not provide any information on current school leaving, and thus does not allow, for example, to identify problems such as early school leaving.
- Education levels in Ireland have greatly improved over time, as more recent age cohorts have attended school for longer durations. Comparative measures at the ED or EA levels only exist for the 1996 and 2002 Censuses, as the 1991 Census expressed the proportion of people attaining each level of education for those in the labour force only.
- The proportions of the adult population in the Ringsend and Irishtown Area who had finished their formal education after primary education has dropped by 7.5 and 10.1 percentage points over the past six years (compared to 6.3 percentage points for Dublin and 7.3 percentage points nationally). However, despite this remarkable achievement, the proportion of adults with primary education only in the most disadvantaged areas remains stubbornly high when compared to its Dublin and nationwide equivalents.
- In the PWA 3 area (comprising the area around Doris Street, Derrynane Gardens and O'Connell Gardens), every third adult finished school after primary education. In the area directly surrounding Ringsend Park (PEA 5) the proportion is 32.6 per cent and in three other EAs of Pembroke East A the proportions exceed 40 per cent. In the estates along Sean Moore Road (PEA 6) 42.4 per cent are with primary education only, along Thorncastle Street (PEA 1) 43.7 per cent and rising to 46.8 per cent in around Stella Gardens (PEA 3) (see Map 7).
- At the opposite end of the educational spectrum, only about one in ten of the last three areas mentioned above have gained a third level education, compared to 32.1 per cent for Dublin City and 33.5 per cent for Dublin as a whole.
- Again, Sandymount offers the opposite extreme, as one of the most educationally endowed areas of Dublin, and indeed Ireland as a whole. Only 10.9 per cent of the adult population in Sandymount North and 4.1 per cent of Sandymount South finished education at primary level, an extraordinary low level particularly in face of the relatively old age profile of the area. This is also expressed at the high end of the educational spectrum with 55.6 per cent of Sandymount North and 66.5 per cent of Sandymount South having attained third level education (Map 8).

7.2 An Analysis of Needs based on the Census Data

Targeting Social Need

The Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area displays a strong social divide, principally between a comparatively disadvantaged part comprising Ringsend and Irishtown, and Sandymount, which is one of the most sought after residential areas of Dublin. The Community Gain Fund, if instituted as part of a planning permission for the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, will have to benefit the whole of the communities most affected by the location of the facility at the Poolbeg peninsula. At the same time, the benefit to the communities as a whole must also take into account the divisions within it: Reducing the social divide within the communities has a beneficial affect on the communities' overall well-being. It is thus recommended that the use to which the Community Gain Fund is being put has some element of targeting towards social need.

Most Disadvantaged Areas

Two areas within Ringsend and Irishtown are amongst the most disadvantaged areas nationwide. These two areas are equally deprived as other areas which are included in the RAPID programme. In the view of the consultants, negotiations should take place to have the areas included in the RAPID programme. The importance of this aspect is, that there are limited resources under the Community Gain Fund to deal with extreme deprivation as exhibited by these two areas. Residents of these areas should have priority access to the existing Government and Local Authority services, as specified under the RAPID programme. Achieving such inclusion would provide an important example of leverage and wider Community Gain as identified in this study.

Demographic Differences

The census data clearly shows the higher concentration of younger families and particularly single parent families in the Ringsend/Irishtown area and an older age distribution in the Sandymount area. These differences will need to be reflected in different emphases for the initiatives funded through the Community Gain Fund. While initiatives in the Ringsend and Irishtown area may have a stronger focus on improving facilities and services aimed at younger people (e.g. sport and recreation) and younger families including single parent households (e.g. childcare facilities, crèches and playgrounds), initiatives in the Sandymount area may have a comparatively stronger focus on community health services and care for the elderly.

Educational Achievement

There are extraordinary differences in educational achievement between the residents of Ringsend and Irishtown on the one hand, and Sandymount on the other. The latter constitutes one of the educationally best endowed areas in the whole country. While there is a clear need for additional initiatives aimed at improving educational achievement in the Ringsend and Irishtown areas, care will need to be taken that this will not amount to an unreasonable drain on the limited resources of the Community Gain Fund. The emphasis thus might be put on achieving a more effective representation vis-à-vis the Department of Education and Science (DES) to gain better access to existing initiatives. Achieving the representation of the DES on the Board of the Initiative and improving such representation would provide another example of possible leverage and wider Community Gain.

7.3 Physical Profile of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount Area

This chapter provides an overview of the facilities and organisations covering the themes of Social and Community, Education and Training, Health, and Sport and Recreation, within the Irishtown, Ringsend and Sandymount areas. Information was gathered from a variety of sources including an on-the-ground physical survey, utilising Dublin City Council contact lists; RING directory; Dublin Docklands Development Authority infrastructure audit; telephone directories, street map and consultations with community leaders.

Social and Community

The Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centres provide a valuable resource for many community groups including youth groups, karate club and as a focus for the community in Ringsend and Irishtown. This facility has recently received funding from the DDDA to enable the upgrading of facilities. The Ringsend and Irishtown area is well served with community services such as a Garda station, post office, library, credit union and a wide variety of residents associations and youth organisations (including scouts). The Sandymount area does not have a community centre but does have several active residents associations, a post office and credit union. The study area also contains many churches some of which are used for community events and as a meeting place (Map 9).

Table 7.1: Social & Community Provisions

	Facilities
Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre	Building has been open for 3 years, has 2 main rooms and 2 port-a-cabins.
Ringsend Public Library	Branch library serving Ringsend, wheelchair accessible and has internet access, community notice board and exhibitions/lectures.
Ringsend Post Office	
Irishtown Garda Station	
Sandymount Credit Union	
Sandymount Post Office	

Education and Training

The study area contains a variety of crèches, primary, post-primary schools and a special needs school. In addition the Ringsend Technical Institute and Ringsend Community Training Centre provide adult education and retraining opportunities (Map 10).

Table 7.2: Education & Training Provisions

Crèches	Description/role
Little Bo Peep Pre-School (ESB)	
Little Pals Pre-school (Enable Ireland)	
Lilliput Childcare	Private crèche
Primary Schools	
Star of the Sea Boys Primary School /Canon O'Hanlon Memorial National School	314 Boys
St Patrick's Boys National School	92 Boys
St Patrick's Girls National School	137 Girls
St. Matthews National School	44 Boys, 47 Girls
St Mary's School, Lakelands	

...continued

Secondary Schools	
Marian College	Marist Brothers, 400 students.

Post Secondary Colleges	
Ringsend Technical Institute	116 Boys, 67 Girls, Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme (VTOS), Ringsend Adult Reading and Writing Scheme, Gym used by Bridge Utd, Ringsend Rovers, Irishtown FC, Pearse Rangers; Facilities used by Dodder Youth Service and DCC.
Ringsend Community Training Centre Limited	

Health

The Ringsend and Irishtown areas are served by the Ringsend Medical Centre, Irishtown Health Centre and Irishtown Day Care Centre, while the Park Avenue Medical Centre provides a similar service for the Sandymount area. There are several doctors' surgeries throughout the area as well as drug rehabilitation groups (Spellman Centre). The Rehab Centre on Beach Road provides longer-term care for people with disabilities (Map 12).

Sport and Recreation

The study area contains a variety of parks including Ringsend Park (10.5ha), Sean Moore Park (10ha) and Irishtown Nature Park (8ha) all of which have been built on reclaimed land. The area also has many open spaces along the seafront, including the Great South Wall, Sandymount Strand (700ha), three beaches and foreshore, the 1km long Sandymount Promenade which was completed in the 1970's, and along the Dodder Riverbank.

The study area is well-served by sporting facilities. These include grounds at which people are more likely to be spectators such as Lansdowne Road and Shelbourne Park greyhound stadium to high quality recreational facilities such as Irishtown Stadium (track and field sports); ESB Sportsco (pool, gym, badminton, table-tennis, squash and volleyball); the new YMCA facilities (gym, cricket, hockey and soccer); Lansdowne Lawn Tennis Club (tennis as well as golf, walking and bridge clubs); Railway Union Sports Ground (cricket, rugby, hockey and multi-sports). Many clubs and associations utilise playing pitches and facilities within these venues and the public parks. In addition there are a variety of venues and clubs associated with the nearby marine environment such as two rowing clubs (Stella Maris and St Patrick's), Poolbeg Yacht and Boat Club, Gleeson's Fishing Club, SurfDock (windsurfing, canoeing and dinghy sailing) and Flagship scuba (scuba diving). In addition there are a number of small playgrounds within residential areas (Ringsend Park Play Area and O'Rahilly House Playground) (Map 11).

Table 7.3: Sports and Recreational Amenities

Public Parks	
Ringsend Park	This is a large public park with a children's playground and several playing pitches. (9.65ha)
Sean Moore Park	This is a reclaimed park, adjoining the seafront, with the majority given over to Clanna Gael GAA Club. (10.18ha)
Irishtown Nature Park	This is reclaimed land which is becoming of increasing significance for birdlife. Some walks are laid out. There is an area of flat grassland which is used by migrating birds. (7.56ha)
Sandymount Green	Sandymount Green, managed by Dublin City Council, is a small public green with benched seating in the centre of Sandymount. Laid out in the 1880's and 0.3ha in area. Primarily passive recreational use.
Public Open Space	
Sandymount Strand	The 700ha of Sandymount Strand which is underwater at high tide is a large recreational resource when uncovered.
Sandymount Promenade	Sandymount Promenade which is 1km long was completed in the 1970's. Several notable features include the Martello Tower which was completed in 1804 .
Great South Wall	A popular recreational resource, the 5km long Great South Wall was completed in 1786. Many people walk out to the Poolbeg Lighthouse to gain a panoramic view back to the city and mountains.
Three Beaches	These are three small beaches that have formed following reclamation. They are located by the start of the Great South Wall walk, by the Irishtown nature Park and by Sean Moore Park.
Foreshore	The foreshore in between the three beaches between the Great South Wall and Sean Moore Park
Dodder Riverbank	The riverbank has been recently upgraded in parts and provides a recreational resource for the area.
Stadia	
Lansdowne Rugby Ground	The oldest international rugby ground in the world with 3 pitches, changing facilities, clubhouse and 3 function rooms. A planning application to redevelop the stadium is currently with Dublin City Council.
Shelbourne Park Greyhound Stadium	The recently rebuilt stadium consists of a racing track, function room and bar.
Swimming Pools	
ESB Sportsco Pool	The swimming pool, part of the ESB Sportsco complex is a 25m 6 lane indoor pool with annual membership fee of 220 plus €4 per swim or €199 for the year.
Marian College	The pool is 20m, has 3 lanes and is open to the public.

...continued

Marine Related Facilities	
SurfDock and Flagship Scuba Dive Club	The SurfDock and Flagship clubs operate from the converted Aran Islands ferry M.V. Naomh Eanna. SurfDock: windsurfing supplies and equipment, dinghy, windsurfing and canoeing courses, corporate and barbeque evenings. Flagship: scuba-diving: diving equipment and supplies, PADI courses.
Stella Maris Rowing Club	
St Patrick's Rowing Club	
Poolbeg Yacht and Boat Club	The yacht club which was recently enlarged with a grant from the DDDA has 100 berths and a clubhouse.
Children's Facilities	
Ringsend Park Playground	The playground has 4 metal swings, 5 junior wooden swings and 2 large metal pieces on a wood chip surface.
O'Rahilly House Playground	
Sports Centres/Playing Fields	
ESB Sportsco	The ESB Sportsco centre was built in 1978 for ESB staff members and its members are still primarily ESB staff, though a large part of the membership is from the surrounding area. The facility contains a gym, 4 squash courts, 4 all-weather football pitches and 5 tennis courts, sports hall, club bar and function room as well as a 6-lane swimming pool.
YMCA Sports Ground	The sports centre which has recently undergone a €3m facelift contains club rooms, meeting rooms, gym, an all weather hockey pitch, cricket ground, soccer pitch and youth café.
Lansdowne Lawn Tennis Club	The tennis club has 11 floodlit artificial grass courts, changing rooms, viewing areas, function room and bar.
Irishtown Stadium	This is a €6.5m project, funded by Department of Arts, Sports and Tourism, Dublin City Council and Dublin Docklands Development Authority and opened in 2004. Facilities include: 400m athletics track with field sports facilities surrounding a soccer pitch, 6 5-a-side all weather floodlit pitches, pavilion with changing rooms, showers, gym, equipment store, committee rooms and kitchen.
Railway Union Sports Ground	The grounds consist of a full size bowling green, cricket ground, full size rugby pitch, 2 soccer pitches, 5 all-weather floodlit tennis courts, 5 grass courts, licensed bar, function hall.
Sydney Parade Ground	Cricket and rugby ground with changing facilities (used by Pembroke CC and Monkstown Rugby Club).
Westwood Club	The Westwood Club has the only heated indoor seawater swimming pool in the east of Ireland, gym, fitness classes, spa, crèche, the highest climbing wall in Ireland and a sandwich bar.

7.4 An Analysis of Needs from the Physical Audit

Social and Community

The northern part of the study area (Ringsend/Irishtown) is mainly served by the Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre, the Ringsend Action Project and by public services. The Sandymount area is less well catered for, with a lack of a central community centre, although there are several active community groups.

Education and Training

The area has a variety of crèche and primary schools, although some of these such as St Patrick's Girls National School are in need of refurbishment. A recent study (Buchanan et al. 2004) recommended two new primary schools for the Ringsend, Irishtown and Poolbeg area. Although there are no state secondary schools within the study area, some secondary schools near the area have closed in recent years due to falling numbers, such as St Mary's Secondary School, Haddington Road. Others facilities such as Ringsend Technical Institute have considerable available capacity (around 300-400 students) but is in need of modernisation. The study area is also served by nearby post-primary schools such as CBS Westland Row and St Michael's College, Ailsebury Road.

Health

The area is served by a variety of local medical centres and doctors surgeries. The closest Accident and Emergency Department is at St Vincent's Hospital which is relatively close to the study area.

Sport and Recreation

Ireland does not have any minimum standards for recreation and leisure facility provision. The Department of Arts, Sports and Tourism does not have any standards for recreation and sports provision and the Dublin City Development Plan (DCC 2005) only has standards for minimum open space provision for new development (10 %) but not for overall recreational facility provision. The Irish Sports Council does not have minimum standards of facility provision.

There have been two recent reports carried out for local authorities, for counties Westmeath (2002) and Cork (2003) which provide some insight into standards for recreation and leisure facility provision.

The Westmeath County Council study *Sports, Recreation and Leisure Facilities and Needs Survey Report*, (Westmeath County Council, 2002) quotes Torkildsen's (1999) standards for facility provision:

Table 7.10: Sports and Recreation Standards

Facility	Standards	Facility Standards Recommended by:
Outdoor recreation 'playing' space	6 acres/1000 pop.	National Playing Fields Association
Outdoor equipped playgrounds	0.5-0.7 acres/1000 population	National Playing Fields Association
Casual/informal play space within housing areas	1.0-1.25 acres/1000 pop	National Playing Fields Association
Athletics and miscellaneous	0.5 acres/1000 pop	National Playing Fields Association
Golf Courses	1 nine hole/18.000pop	Sports Council

...continued

Parks		
Metropolitan	150 acres within 2 miles of pop	Greater London Development Plan
District	50 acres within 0.75 mile of pop	Greater London Development Plan
Local	5 acres within 0.25 mile	Greater London Development Plan
Small Local	Under 5 acres	Greater London Development Plan
Indoor Sports Centres	1/40.000-90.000 pop	Regional Sports Council
Indoor Pools	1 25m pool and 1 learner pool/40.000-45.000 pop	Regional Sports Council
Squash Courts	1/5.000 pop	Squash Racquets Assoc.
Artificial turf pitches	1/60.000 pop	English Sports Council

Source: Torkildsen G (1999)

The report identifies three tasks that need to be undertaken before the design and construction of facilities is started. These are:

- An audit of existing facilities;
- A future needs or opportunity analysis and;
- Classification of facility types required.

The report further identifies eight categories of facilities in sport and recreation, these are:

- Outdoor recreation and sports facilities
- Indoor recreation and sports centres
- Swimming pools and aquatic facilities
- Local open spaces and facilities
- Neighbourhood parks
- Children's play facilities
- Cycle tracks, walking trails and horse riding trails
- Recreation and sport use of rivers and lakes.

Within the *Cork Recreational Facility Needs Study*, (Cork County Council, 2003), the main standard referred to is the UK's National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) 'Six acre standard'. This standard, which recommends a minimum standard of 6 acres (2.4ha) of outdoor playing space per 1000 population, is also considered generally applicable to Ireland. Outdoor playing space is not the same as public open space. The NPFA defines outdoor playing space as '*space that is safely accessible and available to the general public and of a suitable size and nature, for sport, active recreation or children's play.*' It is also important that these standards are a minimum and should be exceeded where possible.

The Cork study outlines facilities that the NPFA considers should be included as outdoor playing space which are: facilities in the ownership of local government (pitches, greens, courts, athletics tracks and training areas); publicly available facilities within the education sector; facilities within the voluntary, private, industrial and commercial sectors which serve outdoor recreational needs of their members or the public; designated children's areas containing a range of facilities and casual or informal space within housing areas.

Those areas that the NPFA considers should not be included are outdoor sports facilities which are not, as a matter of policy or practice, available for public use e.g. professional sports stadia; verges, woodland commons, seashore nature conservation areas (e.g. Sandymount Strand), allotments and ornamental gardens and parks (e.g. Sandymount Green) (except where there are clearly defined areas within for sports, games, practice and play); golf facilities; private grounds of professional or semi-professional clubs; water used for recreation; sports halls or leisure centres; commercial entertainment complexes and theme parks; and non recreational use car parks.

There is a difficulty with applying area-based catchment areas to an urban population given that any residential area is not self-contained and will have access to facilities both in the immediate surrounding area and to other facilities within the urban area. However, it is considered that the 6 acre standard can be applied to the population catchment of the Ringsend, Irishtown, Sandymount areas.

Sport and Recreation: How the study area compares to standard provision

The population of the area was 15,040, based on the 2002 Census of Population. Applying the 2.4ha per 1,000 population standard, open space provision should be in the region of 36ha. Areas of suitable outdoor playing space would include Ringsend Park (9.65ha), Sean Moore Park (10.18ha), Irishtown Stadium (3.12ha), the YMCA grounds (2.53ha), Railway Unions Sports Grounds (4.31ha), Sydney Parade Ground (2.82ha); Marian College grounds (0.76ha), the practice grounds at Lansdowne Road (0.93ha) and the relatively level section of Irishtown Nature Park (c.3ha). The small areas of additional open space and play ground within housing developments such as O'Rahilly House, would also add a small amount to the total figure. The total for the area of public playing space is approximately 37ha to serve the existing population of the area.

It can be further argued that the study area is not a self-contained community such as a village and that the population will also have access to additional nearby facilities such as Herbert Park, Merrion Cricket grounds and other nearby playing pitches. Similarly, the facilities in the study area are available to the population of surrounding communities and the city at large.

While the quantity of open space meets the identified standards, the quality of provision and their accessibility are not always adequate. For example, Irishtown Nature Park is extremely isolated from the communities that it serves both in terms of distance and in the quality of the connections. The pedestrian and road links pass through industrial areas on Southbank Road, which are not attractive to potential users of the park.

With regards to outdoor equipped playgrounds the NPFA recommends 0.5-0.7 acres per 1000 population. This would give a figure of around 7.5-10.5 acres of equipped playing space. The study area currently only has equipped playing spaces at the northern end, at Ringsend Park and O'Rahilly House, and so could be said to be lacking in this regard, particularly in the Sandymount and Irishtown areas. As well as children's facilities, the area contains few public youth facilities such as skateboard parks and basketball courts.

With regards to athletics grounds the standard of 0.5 acres per 1000 would require 7.5 acres or 3ha, Irishtown Stadium alone would fulfil this requirement.

Torkildsen's standards suggest 1 nine-hole golf course per 18,000 residents. There are no golf courses within the study area although there are several in the south Dublin area.

The area is well-served by public parks, swimming pools (ESB, Marian College and Westwood) and squash courts (ESB).

The population growth and new development that is expected in the Poolbeg peninsula over the medium term is expected to add a new population of approximately 9,750 to the study area. These new residents will also require new recreational and social facilities. It is essential that the extent and quality of facilities in the area is expanded commensurately to ensure that the overall quality of life is maintained and enhanced. While new development will put additional pressure on existing facilities, they also provide the opportunity to better connect isolated existing facilities to communities and improve the overall environmental quality.

The General Development Contribution Scheme, adopted by Dublin City Council in 2004, sets out how new development across the functional area of the council will generate funds to support a wide range of infrastructural improvements, including parks and community

facilities. A small number of these facilities are in the study area, including Irishtown Nature Park and the Dodder banks. As the Poolbeg peninsula is expected to contribute a significant proportion of new houses in the city in the medium-term, it may be appropriate that the development contribution scheme is adjusted to ensure that the study area continues to have a sufficient extent and quality of facilities.

7.5 An Analysis of Needs from the MRBI Household Survey

One of the major objectives of the MRBI Household Survey was to find out how residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area felt about the quality of their community infrastructure and the perceived gaps in service provision. To this end, the Survey first asked respondents *“Thinking of this area, what important facilities, services etc. does this area currently lack?”* The question was then followed by prompting respondents to identify which facilities or services should, in their view, receive greatest priority, which they would consider to be the second most important, and which else they would see as important. In total, 1,000 interviews were carried out in a random fashion. After making marginal adjustments to re-weight the data to represent the known population characteristics in terms of age, gender, social class, marital status etc., the following picture emerges in order of preferences expressed:

1. More Sports Facilities for Young People (44%)

The strongest perceived lack of community facilities and services exists with respect to sports and other facilities for young people, with 44 per cent of respondents identifying this as a priority. The responses are higher amongst younger respondents, reaching 62 per cent in the 15-24 year age group. They are also higher amongst lower social classes (51%) and amongst those who are either cohabiting (48%) or single parents (51%), and they are higher amongst families with children (54%). The priority is particularly high amongst those who are unemployed or seeking first employment (67%) and those being student or in full-time education (62%). At a geographical level, the responses are significantly higher in the Ringsend/Irishtown area (53%) as opposed to the Sandymount area (34%).

The high priority given to better provision of sports and recreational facilities for teenagers and young people thus has a clear geographical and social class bias, with those less well-off being in relatively greater need.

The outcome somewhat contrasts with the picture emerging from the physical audit of the area, as well as several other studies on the area, which generally describe the area as one relatively well provided for in terms of sports facilities. However, the apparent contradiction can be explained when taking into account who actually makes use of the existing facilities. Several key stakeholders interviewed raised the point that what is needed is not additional sports facilities, but more active approaches to get young people involved in sports and other recreational activities. The emphasis in responding to this need thus should be less one of enhancement of the physical infrastructure, but more one of employing sports coaches and developing outreach programmes to make the existing opportunities more attractive.

2. More Playgrounds (36%)

The second strongest perceived lack relates to the availability of playgrounds, with 36 per cent of respondents identifying this as a priority. The responses are higher amongst younger parents, accounting for 43 per cent in the 25-44 year age group. They are also higher amongst lower social classes (43%) and amongst those who are cohabiting (52%), and they are higher amongst families with children (53%). The priority was particularly high amongst full-time home makers (50%) and households with four or more children (48%). At a geographical level, the responses were higher in the Ringsend/Irishtown area (44%) as opposed to the Sandymount area (28%).

The high priority given to the improvement of playground facilities thus has again a clear geographical and social class bias, with those less well-off and larger families being in relatively greater need. The outcome is not surprising and tallies with the picture emerging from the physical audit of the area. There is a clear need to provide additional playground facilities, particularly, but not only, in the Ringsend and Irishtown communities.

3. Better Community Services for Elderly People (32%)

The third strongest perceived lack relates to the availability of community services for elderly people, with 32 per cent of respondents identifying this as a priority. The responses are higher amongst the older age groups, accounting for 47 per cent amongst those age 65 and over, and 48 per cent in the 55-64 year age group. The lack is almost equally perceived amongst higher and lower social classes (31% and 33% respectively), but is particularly prevalent amongst those who are retired (47%) and those living on their own (39%). Surprisingly, the lack of services for the elderly was almost equally perceived within each of the geographical areas, rating at 33 per cent in Ringsend/Irishtown, and 31 per cent in Sandymount. Because of the slightly older age profile of the Sandymount community, one might have expected a marginally higher response in that area. This, however, seems to be offset by the greater ability to provide for their old age on account of the greater affluence amongst its citizens.

The outcome is not surprising and tallies with the picture emerging from the physical audit of the area. There is a clear need to provide additional services for the elderly right across the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities.

4. Better Community Health Services (30%)

The fourth strongest perceived lack relates to community health services, with 30 per cent of respondents identifying their improvement as a priority. The responses are higher amongst older residents, accounting for 44 per cent amongst those age 65 and over. They are also higher amongst lower social classes (34%) and those who are either widowed, separated or divorced (45%), and they are higher amongst people living on their own (39%). The priority was particularly high amongst those retired (44%). At a geographical level, the responses were higher in the Ringsend/Irishtown area (36%) as opposed to the Sandymount area (24%).

While mirroring the lack of services for elderly people with regard to the respondents' age profiles, the perceived lack of community health services has a clear geographical and social class bias, with those less well-off and larger families being in relatively greater need.

The high priority towards improving the existing community health services was somewhat surprising, as it had neither emerged as a clear priority from the physical audit, nor from the interviews with key stakeholders. It is also unclear to what extent the provision of additional community health services can and should be catered for through a Community Gain Fund. However, if and when new structures of community representation develop in the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, there is a clear mandate for such a group to negotiate the provision of additional services with the Health Services Executive. With regard to the Community Gain Fund itself, however, such a step should be accommodated in terms of reserving space within any new community centre, to house such services.

5. Improving the Environment

The fifth priority emerging from the MRBI Household Survey is the improvement of the environment. The level of support cannot be presented in the same format as the priorities one to four, as it is split between the improvement of landscaping in the area (27% support) and the improvement of local environmental and heritage facilities which is supported by 14 per cent of respondents. No overall figure can, however, be given, as there can be some overlap between the two possible responses.

Support for environmental improvement is quite evenly spread across the various age groups, except for those under 25, where it features as a lower priority. There is a marginally higher support amongst the better-off classes, but the difference amounts to only two percentage points. Environmental improvements are given similar importance across almost all of the economic statuses, except for those who are unemployed, for whom this is a distinctly less important aspect of their life. The absolute numbers of this group are, however, small and therefore statistically not as robust.

With regard to the geographical areas, an interesting, though not surprising picture emerges. The need for improvements in landscaping are almost equally felt in Ringsend/Irishtown (24%) and Sandymount (28%). The call for the provision of environmental and/or heritage facilities, however, is markedly stronger in the Sandymount area (24%) compared to only 10 per cent in Ringsend/Irishtown.

Having summarized the responses from the MRBI Household Survey as to the best use that a Community Gain Fund might be put, the next section outlines a broad proposal for the possible use of the fund in terms of actual projects or initiatives supported.

7.6 Potential Benefits from a Community Gain Fund

The final section of this chapter outlines a proposal as to how a Community Gain Fund might benefit the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities. The proposal developed here reflects the views of the consultants based on their extensive consultation with the respective communities, and their extensive experience in the local development arena. Nevertheless, it cannot represent more than a proposal. Ultimately, if a Community Gain Fund is instituted in the context of planning permission being granted to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, the formulation of such proposal remains the prerogative of the Board that will oversee the management of the Fund. It will also need to be based on a comprehensive process of negotiation between the different community interests, which lies outside the terms of reference for the present study. Finally, it will crucially depend on the shared vision developed for the development of the area and the Integrated Plan which would outline the communities' aspirations.

The obvious starting point for developing a proposal is the question of the possible size of the fund. To date, Dublin City Council has only made some broad indication as to the size of the possible fund: *"It is proposed that several million euro will be provided in the fund over the first few years of the project when the incinerator is being built and commissioned. After that an amount will be provided each year throughout the lifetime of the project"* (MRBI Household Survey 2006).

Dublin City Council is partly awaiting the outcome of the statutory process, as An Bord Pleanála is likely to require the institution of a Community Gain Fund as a condition if they were to permit the incinerator to go ahead. In the case of the Ringaskiddy incinerator, for example, An Bord Pleanála set a contribution of €1.27 per tonne of waste thermally treated (An Bord Pleanála, Ref. PL04.131196), which broadly explains Dublin City Council's indication of the overall size of the fund.

Following the argument developed in this study, both the question of a monetary fund at all, as well as its possible size should be viewed as much more open. If properly addressed, the mechanism of the fund should be the outcome of a full-scale consultation and negotiation process between the City Council and the three communities, and be assessed in the larger context of other community gains and planning gains agreed between the parties.

Taking into account the underlying socio-economic data, the physical audit of the area, the preferences expressed in the MRBI Household Survey and the interviews with community representatives, we believe that a Community Gain Fund, if instituted, should mainly be used to develop two flagship projects: firstly, the rebuilding of a large-scale community centre to

replace the under-sized existing centre at Thorncastle Street and, secondly a community centre for the Sandymount area. We will briefly outline both of these proposals and then make some concluding remarks about the rationale underlying the proposal.

7.6.1 Re-building of the Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre

The Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre is located at Ringsend House, Thorncastle Street Ringsend, Dublin 4. It is operated under the control of a voluntary Board of Directors. The day to day operation of the centre is overseen by the General Manager. The Centre currently has 15 Job Initiative and Community Employment staff and operates from 08:00 to 22:45, Monday to Friday and at weekends as community activity dictates. The activities at the Centre include provision of a Community Crèche, Health Board Day Care Centre and associated outreach services. The Centre has established a Cyber Room and computer training facilities and is used for the base of the Youth Service in the area under the control of the City of Dublin Youth Services Board (CDYSB). The activities for youth and others include, Karate, Hip Hop Dancing, Art Classes, Computer Classes, Weight Watchers, Yoga, Pilates, Gospel, Drama, Asian Festivals, Ladies Club, Alcohol free disco, Irish Dancing etc.

The land is owned by the community and is held in trust by the Board of Directors. A small part of the site adjacent to the Council Flat Complex (O'Rahilly House) is owned by DCC and the directors have a 27 year lease on this plot. The centre is currently progressing plans to develop the site in conjunction with either DCC or a Contractor or both. The plan is to develop a multi-functional community and youth centre to cater for all the foreseeable demands of the community, with the exclusion of a swimming pool, as this is too expensive to maintain. With the correct handling of this project the community will have all its needs met with no financial demand on them other than for normal usage, overheads, depreciation etc.. With the correct commercial mix the centre could be self-sustaining. The Board has already discussed the plan with DCC which seems to be supportive of the initiative.

The current centre, though providing important services to the community, is completely under-scaled in terms of the potential use of the site where it is situated, as well as to the range of activities it would be able to provide for the community, if expanded. The centre occupies only a fraction (about one-quarter) of the site and is single storey. Yet, the site is surrounded on both sides by high multi-storey buildings. It would thus be possible to build a multi-story building incorporating a sports hall, function rooms, offices and a cafeteria, as well as providing the base for a large number of key community services.

The fundamental reason that makes this proposal such a strong priority is that much of the capital cost could be raised without any cost to the Community Gain Fund, as it could be cross-financed by providing private accommodation on upper storeys. The main aspect with regard to the Community Gain Fund is thus the proper resourcing of the activities run in the centre on an ongoing basis.

The consultants believe that this project tallies extraordinary well with many of the priorities identified in the course of this study:

- It provides a large-scale axis of support which will be able to bring together a variety of services to the community in a single setting.
- The main emphasis would be on providing improved facilities for young people, including a sports hall and other function rooms (the number one priority identified).
- Emphasis will be given to the employment of qualified sports coaches to stimulate the interest amongst young people and to develop outreach services to draw young people into the activities organised (as identified through consultation).
- The centre would be run in a highly professional manner and be well-resourced.
- It would provide a much improved crèche and playground area (both priorities identified).
- It would be able to house improved primary health care services (priority identified)

- It could be used to provide some services for the elderly, notably health care services but also possibly as a base for outreach services as, for example, home help or similar (priority identified).
- The proposal is a high-profile scheme and provides a strong central focus for community initiatives.

7.6.2 Provision of a Sandymount Community Centre

The second priority is less clear in its outline, though not any less important: a community centre for the Sandymount area. There have been repeated attempts towards such an initiative, but all of these ended in their early phases, principally because of the high cost of land in the area and thus the lack of affordability. Partly because of the unique possibility to establish a large-scale community centre for the Ringsend/Irishtown area *without significant capital costs arising*, a significant portion of the Community Gain Fund could be used to meet the high capital costs associated with such a project in the Sandymount area. It thus opens up possibilities which hitherto were unattainable.

There are no plans yet as to where such a centre could be situated, or the principal aims it should serve. Therefore, we can only put down some of the parameters, with the actual requirements of the centre left to the organisation responsible for the running of the Community Gain Fund, if instituted.

The overall orientation of the centre would be quite different to the active and youth orientation of the Ringsend and Irishtown Centre, in as much that it would primarily provide a variety of services aimed at the broader population of the area:

- The centre would provide a medium-sized axis of support which will be able to bring together a variety of services to the community in a single setting.
- The centre would be run in a highly professional manner and be well-resourced.
- The centre would comprise a number of meeting rooms, offices, practices and possibly a cafe.
- The centre would provide rooms and supports for the provision of community health care services (priority identified).
- The centre would act as a base to support home help services and services for the elderly for the Sandymount area (priority identified).
- The centre would provide offices and meeting rooms for the local residents organisations and other community-based entities in the area (priority identified).

If it was possible to find a location near to the seafront, the centre could further be used as the base of a beach warden and accommodate a number of environmental and heritage initiatives. There have been several calls to establish the position of a beach warden similar to that practised on the northside of the city to enhance the sustainable use and protection of the environment of the southside of Dublin Bay. We further would suggest that, if properly sited, the centre could provide the basis for a small heritage centre, particularly with regard to providing information on Dublin Bay, as well as a base for environmental groups that are active in the area.

7.6.3 Rationale for the Proposal

There is a wide range of aspects that underlie the above proposal, which draw together many of the observations made throughout the study. To summarise only the most pertinent aspects, the proposal reflects the following considerations:

- Because of the significant differences in the social composition of Ringsend and Irishtown on the one hand, and Sandymount on the other, a different focus is needed in responding to the needs of each of the communities.

- The proposal observes a careful balance between achieving community gain for all residents, whilst also giving some impetus to targeting social need.
- The emphasis on the provision of two flagship projects, rather than a catalogue of individual projects reflects mainly three considerations:
 - Because of the current fragmentation of community interest, there exists a need for the development of a limited number of high-profile initiatives which are able to bring together various initiatives under one roof and foster greater liaison between the different community groups/interests within each area.
 - Having two flagship projects of considerable size will provide greater leverage with regard to the effective representation of community interests vis-à-vis Dublin City Council and other statutory agencies and departments.
 - From an aspect of 'perceived community gain', the bringing together of a variety of initiatives into two flagship projects maximises the 'visual' affect of community gain.
- The proposal takes account of the fact that there is currently no community centre in the Sandymount area that can act as a focus and resource for the large number of community groups which are active in the area.
- The proposal takes into account that the area, as a whole, is comparatively well served with sports and recreation facilities. As the physical audit revealed, the emphasis in providing improved services in this field should be on the provision of sports coaches and the development of outreach activities which can draw young people into the variety of existing and new facilities. As the young people who need to be reached are concentrated in the more disadvantaged areas, the best location for such services is the proposed enlarged Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre.
- The proposal does not rule out other, smaller projects to be supported through the Community Gain Fund. This is for the Board of the Fund to decide. It does, however, recommend that a large proportion of the overall fund be channelled through the two flagship projects.
- The proposal maximises the potential benefit by drawing on existing plans to re-build the Ringsend and Irishtown Community centre. The plan, which proposes to cover the capital cost through the provision of private property above the community centre, allows a scope to be realised which otherwise would be unattainable. At the same time, and because of the particular opportunity to do so, the proposal allows for significant capital costs to be made available for the purchase of a site for a community centre in Sandymount, which, in the past has consistently been impossible because of the high costs associated with this.
- The proposal thus takes into account the relative mix of once-off capital grants during the development phase of the Waste to Energy facility and an ongoing annual budget to support social and community infrastructure in terms of covering the activities identified for each of the two centres.
- The proposal makes clear provision for the five priorities identified in the MRBI survey:
 - improved sports and recreation for young people (Ringsend/Irishtown)
 - more playgrounds and crèche facilities (Ringsend/Irishtown)
 - better community services for elderly people (mainly Sandymount)
 - better community health services (both centres), and
 - improving the environment (mainly Sandymount)

8 Recommendations

In the light of the discussion provided throughout the report, the consultants make a limited number of key recommendations.

1. Achieving True Community Representation

Consultation and negotiation with the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount communities has to start with taking account of what the real issues, needs and aspirations of these communities are and which of these may form part of a negotiated settlement between the Local Authority, private developer and the affected communities. To this end, Dublin City Council should assist the communities to develop an infrastructure which allows them to formulate, communicate, and ultimately negotiate their concerns.

2. Acknowledging a Comprehensive Definition of Community Gain

Current government policy does endorse the concept of 'community gain', but merely requires that some benefit shall accrue to communities in which proximity major pieces of waste infrastructure are being located. Dublin City Council's intention to set up a Community Gain Fund, if planning permission is granted to the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, is thus within the current minimum requirements.

However, the key aspect of 'community gain' is that it offers some form of compensation for alleviating the inequity and perceived losses incurred by a community when a proposed waste facility is planned for its locality. Internationally, 'community gain' has been implemented in one of three forms: 'community gain', 'planning gain' or 'host community benefits'. To provide a successful basis for consensus building and conflict resolution it is likely that community gain needs to be sought outside the confines of a purely monetary Community Gain Fund.

3. Entering into Real Consultation and Negotiation with the Local Communities

The statutory process is *not* the place of consultation and negotiation. Real consultation and negotiation between Dublin City Council, the private developers, and the three communities should have taken place from the time the proposal for an incinerator on the Poolbeg Peninsula was first made.

While Dublin City Council has made considerable efforts in disseminating information about the Dublin Waste to Energy Project, residents do not perceive this to be objective and independent. Furthermore, information is no substitute for consultation and negotiation. A meaningful process of consultation and consensus building requires appropriate structures of community representation and a comprehensive approach to community gain. Such an approach is also likely to make the management and operation of any ensuing Community Gain Fund more acceptable to the community.

4. Clarifying the Scope of What Can be Negotiated

The scope of what can be negotiated has to take into account the overall needs of the communities most affected by the location of the incinerator. The gains sought by the communities do not have to necessarily be connected directly with the proposed incinerator, nor do they necessarily have to be defined in terms of the benefits accruing on foot of a Community Gain Fund.

Based on international literature and experience, mutual accommodation with regard to the siting of waste facilities has worked best where the authorities have been able to take key aspirations of the respective communities into account. Based on the consultation with community representatives in the course of this study, it is the consultants' belief that the wider issues that surround the development of the communities may be more important than the benefit that may accrue through a Community Gain Fund on its own.

5. Supporting the Development of an Integrated Plan

There is a long history of the use of the Poolbeg Peninsula to provide for the wider needs of Dublin and the region as a whole, with little consideration given to the cumulative effects which this may have on the residents of adjacent communities. Best practice in Ireland and elsewhere shows that the overall development of an area can be framed by means of developing a plan for the area that treats the area in its totality, taking into account the full range of influences, in terms of land use, transport, economic and social issues and environmental impacts. While Dublin City Council has commenced this process with the publication of the Draft Poolbeg/Southbank Framework Plan, there is a need for the communities to develop an Integrated Plan for their area which takes as its starting point the visions and aspirations of the existing communities. Dublin City Council should undertake every step necessary to facilitate the communities to develop appropriate structures of community representation and provide them with the resources necessary to develop such a Plan.

6. Respecting the Interests of the Affected Communities

The communities of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area are under renewed pressure as the area is being affected by a number of large-scale development proposals and city policies, each with a different focus and spatial remit, and none of which considers the combined effects on the residents of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area. Furthermore, the Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region names the Poolbeg Peninsula as the preferred location for a large-scale incinerator to serve the whole of the Dublin region, which is perceived as the largest single threat to the adjacent communities.

The Integrated Plan is likely to recommend potential solutions to the main issues of concern to the community. It is the responsibility of Dublin City Council to take these seriously, enter into consultation with regard to the issues identified and, ultimately, enter into a process of negotiation with the communities about these. This is the true meaning of 'community gain' and this will be reflected in an adopted Integrated Plan accepted by the community.

7. The Community Gain Fund

Based on the extensive audit of the existing community facilities and infrastructure, and the preferences expressed by residents in course of the MRBI household survey, the consultants identify five priorities which should be addressed by the Community Gain Fund: (i) more sports facilities for young people, (ii) more playgrounds, (iii) better community services for elderly people (iv) better community health services, and (v) improving the environment.

Based on an analysis of the social and economic composition of the Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount area, there is some merit to addressing social need, which, as a whole is more strongly concentrated in Ringsend and Irishtown. On the other side, the Community Gain Fund has to provide a reasonably equal benefit to all communities that are affected by the location of the Dublin Waste to Energy Project. Thus, there also has to be a substantive gain to accrue for the residents in Sandymount.

Taking account of the five priorities, the social and economic composition of the area, a fair geographical distribution, and the lack of structures for effective community representation, the consultants believe that the Community Gain Fund should largely be used for the development of two flagship projects: firstly, a large-scale re-building of the Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre and, secondly, a Community Centre for the Sandymount area.

In each case, the centres would act as a centre of community supports along the five priorities identified. The fund would be able to cater both for the associated capital costs, as well as covering the ongoing costs associated with the initiatives. Of equal importance would be that the centres would act as a focus for developing better structures of community representation and towards a process by which the communities can enter effective consultation and negotiation with the respective authorities.

9 Bibliography

- Colin Buchanan and Partners (2004) *Audit of Social Infrastructure*. Dublin: DDDA.
- Corcoran, M. (2003) Urban Regeneration in the City of Dublin: Partnership Structures and Integrated Area Planning.
- Cork County Council (2003) Cork Recreational Facility Needs Study.
- Craig, S. (1994) Progress through Partnership. Dublin: CPA.
- DCC (1999) Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2011.
- DCC (2001) Draft Terms of Reference for Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Dublin Waste to Energy Project.
- DCC (2004 – 2006) *Dublin Waste to Energy Project* – various issues.
- DCC (2004) Dublin City Council Development Contribution Scheme.
- DCC (2005) Manager's Report on the Submissions and Observations to the Draft Southbank/Poolbeg Framework Plan.
- DCC (2006a) Public Consultation on the Development of the City Council's Draft HGV Management Strategy.
- DCC (2006b) Draft HGV Management Strategy for Dublin City – report on Public Consultation Process.
- DCC (2006c) *Draft Community Gain Application Process Document*. Letter of DCC to members of the HARP, O'Connell Street and North East Inner City Monitoring Communities (16 Feb 2006).
- DCC (2006d) Minutes of Dublin City Council, 10/04/2006
- DDDA (1997) Dublin Docklands Area Master Plan.
- DDDA (1999) The Grand Canal Dock Area Master Plan.
- DDDA (2000) Ringsend Area Action Plan.
- DDDA (2005a) Master Plan Monitoring Report 2004.
- DDDA (2005b) 3rd Dublin Docklands Social Regeneration Conference Report 2005.
- DEGW (2002) Dublin South Bank Strategic Development Framework. Dublin: DCC.
- DEGW (2003) *Poolbeg Framework Plan*. Dublin: DCC.
- DEHLG (1997) Guidelines for Integrated Area Plan.
- DEHLG (1998) Waste Management – Changing Our Ways.
- DEHLG (1999a) New Urban Renewal Designation. UR 1/99.
- DEHLG (1999b) 1999 Urban Renewal Scheme Monitoring Guidelines.
- DEHLG (2004) Waste Management – Taking Stock and Moving Forward.

- Dublin City and County Councils (2005) Waste Management Plan for the Dublin Region 2005-2010.
- Dublin Inner City Partnership (1999) Proceedings of the South East Network Planning Workshop.
- Dublin Inner City Partnership (1999-2003) Minutes of various meetings of the South East Area Network (SEAN).
- ESRI (2005) Medium-Term Review 2005-2012.
- Forfás (2001) Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland.
- Haase, T., McKeown, K. and Rourke, S. (1996) Local Development Strategies for Disadvantaged Areas – Evaluation of the Global Grant in Ireland, 1992-1995. Dublin: Pobal.
- Haase, T. and McKeown, K. (2003) Developing Disadvantaged Areas through Area-Based Initiatives – Reflections on over a Decade of Local Development Strategies. Dublin: Pobal.
- Hargaden, M. (1994) *Ringsend and Irishtown Community Life*. Dublin: Ringsend & Irishtown Networking Group.
- KPMG et al. (1996) Study on Urban Renewal Schemes. Dublin: DEHLG.
- Lesbirel, S.H. and Shaw, D. (2005) *Managing Conflict in Facility Siting, An International Comparison*. Cheltenham UK, Northampton MA, US: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Mercator Marketing Research (2002a) *Record of Findings of the Ringsend CIG*. Dublin: DCC.
- Mercator Marketing Research (2002b) *Summary of CIG Report*. Dublin: DCC.
- NESC (2005) NESC Strategy 2006: People, Productivity and Purpose.
- N. Hyland & Lavalley Coleman Solicitors (2002) Legal Opinion in Relation to Siting of a Proposed Incinerator/Thermal Treatment Plant at Poolbeg in Dublin. Dublin: DCC.
- Kenny, B. (2000) *A Feasibility Study on the Need for After School Care in Ringsend*. Dublin: National Children's Resource Centre and Bernardos.
- Ringsend Action Project (1994) *Ringsend Housing Initiative*. Dublin: author.
- Ringsend Action Project (2001) *Area Action Plan Funding Application*. Dublin: author.
- Sable, C. (1996) Ireland – Local Partnerships and Social Innovation. Paris: OECD.
- South West Inner City Network (2001) A Mandate for the Community Representatives to the Liberties/Coombe Integrated Area Plan.
- Taylor, C. (2004) The Pigeon House Hotel Trust.
- Torkildsen, G. (1999) Leisure and Recreation Management.
- Walsh, J., Craig, S. and McCafferty, D. (1998) *Local Partnerships for Social Inclusion?* Dublin: CPA and Oak Tree Press.
- Westmeath County Council (2002) Sports, Recreation and Leisure Facilities and Needs Survey Report.

10 Appendix 1: Forfás (2001) Key Waste Management Issues in Ireland

Chapter 3: The Use of 'Community Gain'

Contention surrounding the siting and management of waste infrastructure, particularly in relation to thermal treatment, is not unusual. A frequent concern raised by receiving communities is that, by hosting such essential facilities, they experience a degree of dis-amenity on behalf of the wider population, yet they are not offered anything in return for this perceived dis-amenity.

The provision of some form of compensation has been suggested as a strategy for alleviating the inequity and perceived losses incurred by a community when a proposed waste facility is planned for its locality. Other countries such as the US, UK and Australia have devised systems of 'community gain', 'planning gain' or 'community host benefits' to create or enhance community support for such a facility, and it is proposed that similar initiatives could be expanded in Ireland.

The sections that follow explain the concepts of community and planning gain in greater detail, review international experience in this area, consider how such an approach could be accommodated within existing national policy and legal frameworks and make proposals on how community gain could best be used as a means to increase community involvement in, and facilitate and accelerate the development of, waste infrastructure in Ireland.

3.3.1 Introduction

The Concept of Community Gain: In surveys and interviews conducted by environmental consultants ERM as part of a study commissioned by Forfás on public attitudes to waste management issues, Irish community groups and members of the public frequently expressed the view that waste management facilities would be more acceptable if some sort of incentive was provided to the receiving community. Such an incentive, they suggested, could be in the form of financial recompense for the local community, the provision by plant operators of needed community infrastructure for the area, or even free electricity for the locality. Further details of the study are outlined in Chapter Two of [the Forfás] report.

In effect, what the respondents sought was some form of 'community gain' to compensate for the perceived and real negative impacts associated with the development of municipal/industrial waste disposal and thermal treatment infrastructure in their area.

Internationally, 'community gain' has been implemented in the form of negotiated agreements between local communities affected and developers offering a benefit confined to that local community.

Experience in Other Countries: In a number of other countries the concepts and practice of 'community gain', 'planning gain' or 'host community benefits' have been used by both the public and private sectors.

Incentives offered in Columbus, Ohio and Boston in the US; Toronto, Alberta, and Halifax in Canada, and Melbourne in Australia have varied depending on the needs of the local community, but all of which included new or improved facilities in the areas of roads, schools, sporting facilities, concert halls and airports.

The approaches adopted in these locations have shared two common features. Firstly, the municipal authority or private-sector plant operator has acted in a commercial way, in that the project has been run as a business rather than a social service. In the case of municipal offers, this has often involved accepting waste from another authority on a commercial basis. Secondly, an intense public consultation process has been initiated to take account of community concerns, and the operator has often entered into dialogue with the community to broker a deal.

Planning Gain: Very closely related to the concept of community gain, is the idea of 'planning gain.' Planning gain refers to planning conditions that the authority requests in response to granting permission for a development. Such practices are common in Australia and the UK. Compensation for the development is provided to the affected community in the form of amenity or recreational facilities.

In Australia, the developer usually pays the local authority or relevant federal body money which is then used to purchase land in a region of high conservation value and thereby increase the size of the region's conservation land-bank. The UK experience has shown again that meaningful consultation has been essential in the successful siting of waste management facilities.

Internationally, planning gain appears to be more common than community gain. An overview of the different types of planning gain practices is presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Different Forms of Planning Gain Employed Internationally

Regulation: Planning agreements may enhance the traditional regulatory role of development control in areas such as the restoration of land after mineral extraction, the phasing of development, and detailed control of future uses or environmental protection. Within this category however, the use of agreements may have broader social and economic objectives.

Physical Infrastructure: Agreements may ensure that roads, drainage, sewerage and land for improvements are provided by the applicant directly or by payment to the local authority, not only where these are necessary for the development to go ahead but also where it has an impact more generally on roads and sewerage systems or car parking.

Social Infrastructure: In Ireland and internationally, a wide range of social facilities, such as schools, crèches, community centres, public open space or rights of way may be provided by the applicant and, as with physical infrastructure, this may be either provided directly or by payment to the local authority. This again raises the problem of distinguishing those facilities that directly serve the proposed development and those facilities that relate to the wider needs of the community.

Broader Planning and Local Authority Objectives: In Ireland and internationally, agreements may seek more generally to implement the policies of the local authorities, especially those in development plans. Two key areas that have become increasingly important in recent years are the achievement of affordable housing and employment objectives such as training or jobs for local residents.

The results of a 1999 study by Ibitay and Pijawka*, which compares successful and unsuccessful outcomes for the siting of hazardous waste facilities in the US, indicates that those states who reported successful siting attempts were slightly more inclined to grant benefits to the receiving communities. Moreover, in two of the successful states, the host communities negotiated directly with the facility developers regarding the types and amount of benefit.

Interestingly, international experience has shown that the use of financial compensation as a form of planning or community gain can be problematic. A 1996 study, for instance, showed that 50.8% of the population of Wolfenshiessen, a small town in Switzerland, were willing to host a waste repository when no compensation was at stake, but when financial compensation was introduced this fraction fell to 24.5%.

In relation to waste management facilities, the types of measures the community might seek could relate to environmental protection of their area, initiatives to monitor the air and water quality on an ongoing basis, or funding to remediate the site after its closure. Specific

examples of the types of negotiated community benefits provided in the US, include a fund of \$100,000 per annum for monitoring the quality of surface and groundwater; an unspecified contribution to a contingency fund to close, monitor, and maintain a landfill in the event of operator default; and an environmental damage contingency fund of up to \$2 million to be held for 10 years after final landfill closure. **Table 3.3** shows the results from a US survey on community preferences for different types of benefits.

Table 3.3 The Desirability of Various Types of Community Benefits as Indicated by a 1993 Survey Carried Out in the US

Desirability of host community benefits	
Type of benefit	% in favour
Free water tests	90
Water quality guarantee	90
More public reports of test results	84
Allow owners to hire their own appraisers	83
Speed limit enforcement	83
Pay present owners property value loss on sale	79
Landscape to hide landfill	76
Restrict landfill hours	74
Control illegal dumping	70
More monitoring wells	63
Establish special fund for problems	62
Support roads	58
Extension of public water if problem develops	57
Restrict number of trucks	52
Pay future owners property loss value on sale	48

Source: R.Fort & L.Scarlett: Too little too late? Reason Public Policy Institute. Policy Study No: 157. April 1993

Irish Legislation seems to be Supportive of Community Incentives: Several provisions within existing national planning legislation appear to be supportive of the concepts embodied in community and planning gain. Section 34 of Planning & Development Act, 2000 specifically makes allowances for the granting of permission for developments with specific conditions attached. Statutory conditions may include measures to reduce/prevent noise and to provide open spaces. In addition, conditions requiring the performance of works, including the provision of facilities; and conditions requiring the payment of development contributions or supplementary contributions to defray the cost of providing infrastructural services and management may be attached.

Furthermore, in the Local Government Act, 2001, there is a strong emphasis on consultation with communities, and by addressing issues of 'community gain' in addition to statutory contributions, there is specific provision for local authorities to establish a 'Community Fund' to provide additional benefits to communities.

A local authority is empowered to finance this fund from appropriate sources, including developers. The emphasis of expenditure from this fund is not on public services such as the resurfacing of roads but rather on amenity, recreational and environmental services and projects with potential to contribute to improved quality of life.

Approaches Similar to Community Gain have already been Employed in Ireland: There is legal provision for local authorities in Ireland, to seek contributions from developers for engineering and infrastructure provision, such as the development of open space, tourist facilities, and education facilities or the support of nature conservation and environmental improvements.

Indeed, the concept of 'planning gain' has been established in Ireland by developers who have agreed to offset part of the benefit they stand to make from the establishment of land-use policies or the permitting of particular forms of development. In such cases, the 'gain' has normally been negotiated between the planning authority and the developer, to the benefit of the community as a whole. This has already occurred in the case of business park development.

Similarly, waste management initiatives in Ireland have established the practice of a proportion of the 'gate fee' being set aside to provide finance for local development projects. The accumulated funds are administered by the local authority in conjunction with the local community. These 'developer initiatives' are complementary and additional to Development Contributions/ Supplementary Development Contributions provisions under current planning and development legislation, which are used to defray the cost of providing infrastructure that a development will use. Their continued use in the future need to be in compliance with a consistent set of guidelines for such practices.

There are also some examples of community gain. For example, a recent wind energy development was given planning permission in County Wexford with no objections from the local community. The local population will benefit from cheaper electricity as a condition to permitting this development to go ahead. Needless to say, the role of meaningful consultation with the community played a key part in this successful application. Indeed, the Best Practice Guidance from the Irish Wind Energy Association regards a consultation programme as a core feature in their planning programmes.

3.3.2 Recommendations

- i. Community incentives, in the form of infrastructure or other facilities benefiting the affected local community should be provided, where appropriate, for waste projects and criteria for the provision of such incentives should be developed. (DEHLG)
- ii. Research should be carried out, in the case of projects where community incentives are relevant, to identify the benefits that will be most effective from the community point of view. (LAs, DEHLG)

3.3.3 Rationale

- i. Community gain can facilitate and accelerate the development of waste management infrastructure required by all of society, while providing some form of equitable compensation for real or perceived negative impacts experienced by the hosting community.
- ii. Community gain has been used successfully in other countries to create and increase community support for the development of new waste management facilities and to increase community involvement in the decision-making process surrounding the development of such facilities
- iii. National planning legislation is supportive of the concepts embodied in community gain, and such approaches could be accommodated within Ireland's existing legislative and policy framework, with minor amendments to existing legislation.
- iv. Approaches similar to community gain have already been successfully employed in Ireland.
- v. A portion of the funding for community gain initiatives could come from waste producers and the private companies promoting the projects, so offering value for money to tax payers and the State.

3.3.4 Implementation

Lessons learned from community and planning gain initiatives in other countries suggest that a number of factors are essential for the successful implementation of such initiatives:

- A good relationship between the community, local authority and developer must be established from the outset. This will not be achieved quickly, and consideration must be given to a long-term approach.
- Early public involvement with the waste facility developers and operators helps to engender a sense of trust between the two, which is a key element in creating a balanced arena of discussion.
- Clear and independent information on the perceived impacts of waste facilities must be given to the community.
- Negotiations with the community, local authority and developer can be assisted through the use of an independent facilitator. This will allow for the easier flow of information and also contribute towards greater trust in the negotiating process.

Specifically in the Irish context, current policy and legislation has established a basis for improved public consultation, which would be key to the community gain negotiation process. However, structures in local government would need to be developed for facilitating communities engaging in effective negotiation with developers.

Guidelines for the operation of 'Community Fund' provided for in the Local Government Act, 2001, to support community initiatives by local authorities should be developed to give clarity and assurance to communities that their interests will be respected. The potential for communities to participate, and be involved in the process of managing the resources and outcomes from the Fund should also be recognised.

The negotiation of community incentives for the delivery of waste management infrastructure appears most easily achievable in the context of a commercial development. This context allows the developer the greatest level of flexibility in responding to community concerns and negotiations, and it also supports criteria for public-private partnership initiatives, and their ability to demonstrate a capacity for innovation and value for money.

For a developer, there will be the necessity to establish certainty and that agreements made with a community have legitimacy and standing and are not liable to be undone by third parties. This reinforces the role of the local political structures in endorsing locally made agreements.

11 Appendix 2: A Socio-Economic Profile

Table A7.1: Overall Affluence/Deprivation Scores

Area	Factor Score 1991	Factor Score 1996	Factor Score 2002	Change 1991 -2002	Zero-centred Score 1991	Zero-centred Score 1996	Zero-centred Score 2002
PWA 1 (Ringsend)			19.7				4.6
PWA 2 (Ringsend)			37.6				22.4
PWA 3 (Ringsend)			12.5				-2.7
PWA 4 (Ringsend)			24.9				9.7
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)			33.8				18.6
Pembroke West A	3.93	16.23	25.5	21.55	3.93	9.30	10.3
PEA 1 (Ringsend)			-12.2				-27.4
PEA 2 (Ringsend)			25.7				10.5
PEA 3 (Ringsend)			-7.2				-22.4
PEA 4 (Ringsend)			18.9				3.7
PEA 5 (Ringsend)			8.0				-7.2
PEA 6 (Irishtown)			-3.9				-19.1
Pembroke East A	-17.65	-9.86	3.9	21.50	-17.65	-16.79	-11.3
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)			38.6				23.5
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)			25.3				10.1
PEB 3 (Sandymount)			39.7				24.5
PEB 4 (Sandymount)			38.4				23.2
PEB 5 (Sandymount)			26.1				11.0
Pembroke East B	23.24	28.90	33.9	10.62	23.24	21.96	18.7
PEC 1 (Sandymount)			43.1				28.0
PEC 2 (Sandymount)			37.1				21.9
PEC 3 (Sandymount)			39.4				24.2
PEC 4 (Sandymount)			43.7				28.5
PEC 5 (Sandymount)			44.1				28.9
Pembroke East C	33.94	37.27	41.0	7.06	33.94	30.33	25.9
Study Area	9.9	17.0	25.3	15.4	9.9	10.1	10.2
Dublin City	-3.1	5.1	15.3	18.4	-3.1	-1.9	.2
South County Dublin	3.0	10.8	20.3	17.3	3.0	3.9	5.2
Dublin Fingal	11.8	18.6	26.0	14.2	11.8	11.7	10.8
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	20.6	26.3	31.2	10.6	20.6	19.4	16.0
Dublin	4.7	12.2	21.0	16.3	4.7	5.3	5.8
Ireland	1.9	9.1	17.4	15.4	1.9	2.2	2.2

Table A7.2: Demographic Characteristics

Area	TOTPOP 1986	TOTPOP 1991	TOTPOP 1996	TOTPOP 2002	POPCHG 1991 %	POPCHG 1996 %	POPCHG 2002 %
PWA 1 (Ringsend)				684			
PWA 2 (Ringsend)				487			
PWA 3 (Ringsend)				759			
PWA 4 (Ringsend)				598			
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)				713			
Pembroke West A	3,233	3,070	3,292	3,241	-5.0	7.2	-1.5
PEA 1 (Ringsend)				718			
PEA 2 (Ringsend)				477			
PEA 3 (Ringsend)				683			
PEA 4 (Ringsend)				596			
PEA 5 (Ringsend)				779			
PEA 6 (Irishtown)				1051			
Pembroke East A	4,458	4,427	4,349	4,304	-7	-1.8	-1.0
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)				981			
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)				582			
PEB 3 (Sandymount)				624			
PEB 4 (Sandymount)				696			
PEB 5 (Sandymount)				712			
Pembroke East B	3,383	3,560	3,524	3,595	5.2	-1.0	2.0
PEC 1 (Sandymount)				797			
PEC 2 (Sandymount)				881			
PEC 3 (Sandymount)				662			
PEC 4 (Sandymount)				761			
PEC 5 (Sandymount)				799			
Pembroke East C	3,377	3,861	3,825	3,900	14.3	-9	2.0
Study Area	14,451	14,918	14,990	15,040	3.2	.5	.3
Dublin City	502,749	478,389	481,854	495,781	- 4.8	0.7	2.9
South County Dublin	199,546	208,739	218,728	238,835	4.6	4.8	9.2
Dublin Fingal	138,479	152,766	167,683	196,413	10.3	9.8	17.1
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	180,675	185,410	189,999	191,792	2.6	2.5	0.9
Dublin	1,021,449	1,070,590	1,058,264	1,122,821	4.8	- 1.2	6.1
Ireland	3,540,643	3,525,719	3,626,087	3,917,203	- 0.4	2.8	8.0

TOTPOP: Total Population

POPCHG: Percentage change in population over previous five years

Table A7.3: Family Characteristics

Area	AGEDEP 1991	AGEDEP 1996	AGEDEP 2002	LONEPA 1991	LONEPA 1996	LONEPA 2002
PWA 1 (Ringsend)			21.3			31.6
PWA 2 (Ringsend)			18.1			28.1
PWA 3 (Ringsend)			31.6			13.0
PWA 4 (Ringsend)			25.6			12.8
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)			30.2			14.3
Pembroke West A		26.9	26.0	16.5	24.1	19.0
PEA 1 (Ringsend)			36.1			53.5
PEA 2 (Ringsend)			22.4			20.0
PEA 3 (Ringsend)			29.1			27.5
PEA 4 (Ringsend)			19.0			28.9
PEA 5 (Ringsend)			29.1			26.4
PEA 6 (Irishtown)			23.5			23.0
Pembroke East A	33.5	32.6	26.8	15.9	22.6	34.6
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)			20.1			21.6
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)			27.5			27.3
PEB 3 (Sandymount)			37.5			14.3
PEB 4 (Sandymount)			32.5			7.1
PEB 5 (Sandymount)			34.7			19.1
Pembroke East B	30.4	29.5	29.6	14.9	16.6	17.2
PEC 1 (Sandymount)			27.1			4.6
PEC 2 (Sandymount)			37.5			11.9
PEC 3 (Sandymount)			30.2			14.7
PEC 4 (Sandymount)			26.3			8.3
PEC 5 (Sandymount)			23.2			8.3
Pembroke East C	28.9	29.6	29.0	10.3	16.4	9.1
Study Area	31.2	29.9	27.9	14.5	20.1	21.0
Dublin City	32.7	31.3	29.0	19.4	25.4	29.1
South County Dublin	36.8	32.3	28.7	13.6	16.9	19.7
Dublin Fingal	36.9	32.9	28.6	9.6	12.7	14.9
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	33.2	32.2	31.6	12.5	14.6	13.9
Dublin	34.2	31.9	29.3	14.8	18.8	21.1
Ireland	38.1	35.1	32.3	10.7	13.8	16.7

AGEDEP: Percentage of population aged under 15 or over 64 years

LONEPA: The percentage of households with children aged under 15 years and headed by a single parent

Table A7.4: Unemployment Rates

Area	UNEMPM 1991	UNEMPM 1996	UNEMPM 2002	UNEMPF 1991	UNEMPF 1996	UNEMPF 2002
PWA 1 (Ringsend)			6.3			6.7
PWA 2 (Ringsend)			6.5			3.3
PWA 3 (Ringsend)			9.5			3.9
PWA 4 (Ringsend)			7.2			6.0
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)			4.3			3.8
Pembroke West A	17.9	13.0	6.8	11.7	8.4	4.8
PEA 1 (Ringsend)			19.0			20.5
PEA 2 (Ringsend)			5.8			5.5
PEA 3 (Ringsend)			15.8			10.3
PEA 4 (Ringsend)			10.0			9.9
PEA 5 (Ringsend)			12.4			8.9
PEA 6 (Irishtown)			16.5			8.7
Pembroke East A	31.4	28.3	13.7	24.4	24.3	10.4
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)			2.1			2.4
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)			9.3			7.3
PEB 3 (Sandymount)			4.7			3.8
PEB 4 (Sandymount)			3.9			3.0
PEB 5 (Sandymount)			2.8			6.5
Pembroke East B	12.2	7.9	4.0	9.9	7.2	4.3
PEC 1 (Sandymount)			4.1			3.3
PEC 2 (Sandymount)			3.3			2.1
PEC 3 (Sandymount)			1.8			4.2
PEC 4 (Sandymount)			5.0			3.5
PEC 5 (Sandymount)			5.8			2.4
Pembroke East C	7.8	6.5	4.1	6.3	4.7	3.1
Study Area	18.2	14.8	7.6	12.4	10.7	5.7
Dublin City	24.7	22.4	11.8	17.4	15.2	8.7
South County Dublin	18.3	16.7	8.3	14.4	12.1	7.6
Dublin Fingal	14.1	12.6	7.0	12.1	9.5	6.6
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	12.5	10.7	6.1	10.3	8.2	5.2
Dublin	19.7	17.6	9.3	14.9	12.5	7.6
Ireland	18.4	16.4	9.4	14.1	12.0	8.0

UNEMPM: The male unemployment rate according to the Census of Population

UNEMPF: The female unemployment rate according to the Census of Population

Table A7.5: Social Class Characteristics

Area	HLP 1991	HLP 1996	HLP 2002	LSK 1991	LSK 1996	LSK 2002
PWA 1 (Ringsend)			31.6			19.8
PWA 2 (Ringsend)			54.0			9.7
PWA 3 (Ringsend)			31.1			21.0
PWA 4 (Ringsend)			41.5			15.1
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)			50.8			7.6
Pembroke West A	24.1	32.8	40.9	26.1	19.7	15.0
PEA 1 (Ringsend)			9.9			43.1
PEA 2 (Ringsend)			40.5			16.4
PEA 3 (Ringsend)			15.2			40.4
PEA 4 (Ringsend)			36.7			22.9
PEA 5 (Ringsend)			21.8			26.0
PEA 6 (Irishtown)			11.9			36.4
Pembroke East A	9.3	11.5	20.5	46.0	40.2	32.2
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)			46.6			8.6
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)			45.7			12.0
PEB 3 (Sandymount)			70.2			3.7
PEB 4 (Sandymount)			60.9			6.8
PEB 5 (Sandymount)			47.2			16.5
Pembroke East B	43.8	47.7	53.4	11.9	9.6	9.5
PEC 1 (Sandymount)			65.4			3.6
PEC 2 (Sandymount)			53.9			3.6
PEC 3 (Sandymount)			51.2			4.7
PEC 4 (Sandymount)			67.0			3.3
PEC 5 (Sandymount)			65.1			3.4
Pembroke East C	55.0	60.8	60.6	6.5	3.9	3.7
Study Area	32.4	37.3	43.2	23.5	19.3	15.8
Dublin City	21.7	23.8	29.3	29.3	25.6	20.3
South County Dublin	25.6	26.7	32.7	22.4	21.2	16.2
Dublin Fingal	34.9	35.5	40.2	18.9	17.9	13.6
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	43.9	47.4	51.2	14.2	12.0	9.3
Dublin	28.5	30.5	35.7	23.5	20.8	16.2
Ireland	25.2	27.3	31.6	28.2	24.4	20.2

HLP: Percentage of persons in households headed by 'Professionals' or 'Managerial and Technical' employees, including farmers with 100 acres or more

LSK: The percentage of persons in households headed by 'Semi-skilled Manual' and 'Unskilled Manual' workers, including farmers with less than 30 acres

Table A7.6: Education Levels

Area	EDLOW 1991	EDLOW 1996	EDLOW 2002	EDHIGH 1991	EDHIGH 1996	EDHIGH 2002
PWA 1 (Ringsend)			24.7			40.5
PWA 2 (Ringsend)			7.1			68.2
PWA 3 (Ringsend)			34.3			24.8
PWA 4 (Ringsend)			20.0			47.7
PWA 5 (Irishtown - part)			13.6			57.6
Pembroke West A	n/a	28.6	21.1	n/a	35.1	45.9
PEA 1 (Ringsend)			43.7			8.2
PEA 2 (Ringsend)			18.2			48.5
PEA 3 (Ringsend)			46.8			11.0
PEA 4 (Ringsend)			22.7			48.0
PEA 5 (Ringsend)			32.6			23.5
PEA 6 (Irishtown)			42.4			6.9
Pembroke East A	n/a	46.3	36.2	n/a	11.1	21.0
PEB 1 (Irishtown - part)			5.3			64.2
PEB 2 (Irishtown - part)			21.4			47.4
PEB 3 (Sandymount)			5.8			59.0
PEB 4 (Sandymount)			7.4			64.8
PEB 5 (Sandymount)			15.7			41.7
Pembroke East B	n/a	14.2	10.9	n/a	47.0	55.6
PEC 1 (Sandymount)			1.9			67.5
PEC 2 (Sandymount)			8.9			54.0
PEC 3 (Sandymount)			5.6			64.5
PEC 4 (Sandymount)			2.1			72.4
PEC 5 (Sandymount)			2.0			74.5
Pembroke East C	n/a	6.6	4.1	n/a	57.1	66.5
Study Area	n/a	24.7	18.8	n/a	36.7	46.1
Dublin City	39.7	31.5	23.6	13.7	22.5	32.1
South County Dublin	33.7	23.8	18.0	12.6	19.9	27.3
Dublin Fingal	27.1	18.3	13.6	16.9	25.4	33.1
Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown	19.2	14.6	11.7	28.4	38.9	45.0
Dublin	33.1	25.0	18.7	16.7	25.4	33.5
Ireland	36.8	29.5	22.2	13.1	19.7	26.0

EDLOW: Percentage of adult population with a Primary School education only (1991 estimates)

EDHIGH: Percentage of adult population with a Third Level education (1991 estimates)

Maps 1 to 8 provide a pictorial presentation of the data shown in the above tables.

Map 1: Population in Ringsend, Irishtown and Sandymount

Map 2: Relative Affluence and Deprivation

Map 3: Proportion of Population under 15 Years of Age

Map 4: Proportion of Population Aged 65 and over

Map 5: Proportion of Lone Parents

Map 6: Proportion of Local Authority Rented Households

Map 7: Proportion of Adult Population with Primary Education only

Map 8: Proportion of Adult Population with Third Level Education.

12 Appendix 3: Listing of Entities included in Physical Audit

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Social & Community			
Residents Association	Canon Mooney Gardens Residents Association	Cambridge Road	Ringsend
Community Group	Ringsend and Irishtown Summer Project	Cannon Mooney Gardens	Ringsend
Club	21st Dublin Scout Group (4th Port Dodder)	Dodder Bank	Ringsend
Venue	Ringsend Public Library	Fitzwilliam Street	Ringsend
Local Media	News Four	Fitzwilliam Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Sandymount Community Services	Fitzwilliam Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Ringsend Action Project (Ringsend Community Training Centre Limited)	Fitzwilliam Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Cambridge Court Senior Citizens	Penrose Street	Ringsend
Residents Association	Ringsend & Irishtown Residents Association	Pine Road	Ringsend
Community Group	Ringsend Reg Fishermen & Private Boatowners Association	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Venue	Ringsend & Irishtown Community Centre	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Drama Class	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Weightwatchers	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Club	Four Seasons Youth Club	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Dodder Youth Service	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Ringsend & Irishtown Summer Project	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Post Office	Ringsend Post Office	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Residents Association	O' Rahilly House Residents Association	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Community Group	Ringsend Liaison Group	Whelan House	Ringsend
Residents Association	Whelan House Tenants Group	Whelan House	Ringsend
Residents Association	George Reynolds House Residents Group	George Reynolds House	Irishtown
Garda Station	Irishtown Garda Station	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Credit Union	Ringsend and District Credit Union	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Residents Association	Stella Gardens Residents Association	Stella Gardens	Irishtown
Community Group	Ringsend Active Retirement Association	Strasbourg Terrace	Irishtown
Community Group	Ballroom of No Romance	The Square	Irishtown
Credit Union	Sandymount Credit Union	Bath Avenue	Sandymount
Residents Association	Bath Avenue & District Residents Association Ltd	Bath Avenue	Sandymount
Residents Association	Sandymount & Merrion Residents Association	Castle Park	Sandymount
Community Group	Sandymount and District Heritage Trust Ltd	Dromard Terrace	Sandymount
Nursing Home	Dublin Central Mission Mount Tabor Care Centre and Nursing Home	Newgrove Avenue	Sandymount
Residents Association	Sandymount Residents Association	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Residents Association	Marine Drive Residents Association	Prospect Terrace	Sandymount
Residents Association	Sydney Parade Avenue Residents Association	Sydney Parade Avenue	Sandymount
Post Office	Sandymount Post Office		Sandymount

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Education & Training			
Primary School	St Patrick's Boys National School	Cambridge Road	Ringsend
Primary School	St Patrick's Girls National School	Cambridge Road	Ringsend
College	Ringsend Technical Institute	Cambridge Road	Ringsend
Training/Enterprise	Ringsend Community Training Centre Limited	Fitzwilliam Street	Ringsend
Creche	Little Bo-Peep Pre-School (ESB)	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Creche	Ringsend & Irishtown Community Playgroup/Creche (Ringsend & Irishtown Community Centre)	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Primary School	St. Matthews National School	Cranfield Place	Irishtown
School	St Mary's School	Gilford Road	Sandymount
College	Marian College	Herbert Road	Sandymount
School	Star of the Sea Boys Primary School	Leahy's Terrace?	Sandymount
School	Enable Ireland Special Needs School	Sandymount Avenue	Sandymount
Primary School	Canon O'Hanlon Memorial National School	Sandymount Road	Sandymount
Creche	Christchurch Methodist Church Creche	Sandymount Road	Sandymount
Creche	Little Pals Pre-School (Enable Ireland)	Sandymount Road	Sandymount
Creche	Liliput Childcare	South Lotts Road	Sandymount

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Health			
Health Centre	Ringsend Medical Centre	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Health Centre	Irishtown Day Care Centre	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Doctor's Surgery	Doctor's Surgery	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Doctor's Surgery	Doctor's Surgery	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Health Centre	Physio Needs	Bath Street	Irishtown
Health Centre	Irishtown Health Centre	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Health Centre	Spellman Centre	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Community Group	Ringsend & District Response to Drugs	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Community Group	Sandymount Home Help Service	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Doctor's Surgery	Doctor's Surgery	Beach Road	Sandymount
Health Centre	Rehab Group	Beach Road	Sandymount
Community Group	Rehab Care	Beach Road	Sandymount
Community Group	Independent Living Community Services	Beach Road	Sandymount
Health Centre	Park Avenue Medical Centre	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Doctor's Surgery	Doctor's Surgery	Sandymount Road	Sandymount

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Sport and Recreation			
Club	C.Y.M.S. Active Retirement Association	C.Y.M.S.	Ringsend
Venue	SurfDock & Flagship Scuba Dive Club	Grand Canal Dock Yard	Ringsend
Club	SurfDock & Flagship Scuba Dive Club	Grand Canal Dock Yard	Ringsend
Venue	Lansdowne Rugby Ground	Lansdowne Road	Ringsend
Club	Lansdowne Rugby Club	Lansdowne Road	Ringsend
Club	Wanderers Rugby Club	Lansdowne Road	Ringsend
Venue	Stella Maris Rowing Club	Pigeon House Road	Ringsend
Club	Stella Maris Rowing Club	Pigeon House Road	Ringsend
Public Open Space	Great South Wall	Poolbeg	Ringsend
Club	Irishtown F.C	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	South Dock Celtic	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Vintage United	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Bridge United	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Cambridge Boys FC	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Pearse Rangers Football Club	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Ringsend Rovers	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Club	Ringsend Community Games	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Playground	Ringsend Park Play Area	Ringsend Park	Ringsend
Venue	Sean Moore Park	Sean Moore Road	Ringsend
Venue	E.S.B. Sportsco Pool	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Venue	E.S.B. Sportsco	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
	E.S.B. Gym	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Club	E.S.B. Badminton Club	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Club	E.S.B. Sportsco Table Tennis Club	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Club	E.S.B. Sportsco Squash Club	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Club	E.S.B. Sportsco Volleyball Club	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Venue	Greyhound Stadium	South Lotts Road	Ringsend
Venue	Poolbeg Yacht and Boat Club	Southbank	Ringsend
Club	Poolbeg Yacht and Boat Club	Southbank	Ringsend
Club	Irish National Wadu Kai Federation Ringsend Karate Club (Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre)	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Club	Ringsend Karate Club (Ringsend and Irishtown Community Centre)	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Playground	O' Rahilly House Playground	Thorncastle Street	Ringsend
Venue	St Patricks Rowing Club	York Road	Ringsend
Club	Gleesons Fishing Club		Ringsend
Public Park	Ringsend Park		Ringsend
Public Open Space	3 no. beaches		Ringsend/Irishtown
Public Open Space	Foreshore		Ringsend/Irishtown
Club	Lansdowne Lawn Tennis Club	Londonbridge Road	Irishtown
Club	Lansdowne Golf, Walking and Bridge Clubs	Londonbridge Road	Irishtown
Public Park	Irishtown Nature park	Poolbeg	Irishtown
Venue	Irishtown Stadium		Irishtown
Club	Crusaders Athletic Club		Irishtown
Club	Markievicz Celtic F.C.		Irishtown
Club	Liffey Wanderers		Irishtown
Club	St. Patrick's C.Y.F.C.		Irishtown

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Club	Dublin Kayak Adventure Club	Bath Avenue	Sandymount
Venue	YMCA Sports Ground	Claremont Road	Sandymount
Club	Y.M.C.A. Cricket Club	Claremont Road	Sandymount
Club	Y.M.C.A. Hockey Club	Claremont Road	Sandymount
Club	Y.M.C.A. Soccer Club	Claremont Road	Sandymount
Club	Leinster Branch Irish Hockey Association	Cranfield Place	Sandymount
Venue	Marian College Swimming Pool (Marian College)	Herbert Road	Sandymount
Venue	Lansdowne Lawn Tennis Club	Londonbridge Road	Sandymount
Venue	Railway Union Sports Ground	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Railway Union Cricket Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Railway Union Multi Sports Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Railway Union Rugby Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Railway Union Hockey Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Railway Union F.C.	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Bank of Ireland Sports and Social Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Venue	Sydney Parade Ground	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Pembroke Cricket Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	Monkstown FC Rugby Club	Park Avenue	Sandymount
Club	St. Patrick's/Sandymount Tae-Kwon-Do Clubs (St Mary Star of the Sea Church)	Sandymount Road	Sandymount
Club	Clanna Gael Fontenoy Summer Camp	Sean Moore Road	Sandymount
Club	Clan Na Gael Fontenoy G.A.A. Club	Sean Moore Road	Sandymount
Venue	Westwood Club	St Johns Road	Sandymount
Club	Irish Academy Of Arms	St. Johns Road	Sandymount
Club	The Irish Fencing School	St. Johns Road	Sandymount
Public Park	Sandymount Green		Sandymount
Public Open Space	Sandymount Promenade		Sandymount
Public Open Space	Sandymount Strand		Sandymount
Public Open Space	Dodder Riverbank		Sandymount

Type	Name	Address3	Address4
Religious			
Church	Ringsend Church	Bridge Street	Ringsend
Church	St. Patrick's Church	Cambridge Road	Ringsend
Church	St Mathews		Ringsend
Church	Irishtown Church of Ireland	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Church	Christian Brethren	Irishtown Road	Irishtown
Church	Sandymount Church	Oswald Road	Sandymount
Church	Christchurch Methodist Church	Sandymount Green	Sandymount
Church	St. Mary's Star of the Sea Church	Sandymount Road	Sandymount
Church	St John the Evangelist		Sandymount

Maps 9 to 13 provide a pictorial presentation of the data shown in the above tables.

- Map 9: Distribution of Social and Community Facilities
- Map 10: Distribution of Education and Training Facilities
- Map 11a,b: Distribution of Sports and Recreational Facilities
- Map 12: Distribution of Health Facilities
- Map 13: Distribution of Religious Centres