

Environmental Report: Addendum III

Environmental Consequences of Relevant Recommendations contained in the Third Manager's Report

Draft Sligo and Environs Development Plan 2010-2016

for:

Sligo Borough Council

City Hall
Quay Street
Sligo
County Sligo



&

Sligo County Council

County Hall
Riverside
Sligo
County Sligo



by: CAAS (Environmental Services)

4th Floor, 7 Red Cow Lane
Smithfield
Dublin 7



OCTOBER 2009

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
1.1	Terms of Reference.....	2
1.2	Process for making a new Development Plan for Sligo and Environs	2
2	Environmental Consequences of Manager’s Recommendations	4
2.1	Recommendations not to adopt Proposed Amendments.....	4
2.2	Recommendations to Modify Proposed Amendments.....	6
2.3	Recommendation on Submission No. LSDP-5 and Manager’s Supplementary Recommendation No. 6	7

1 Introduction

1.1 Terms of Reference

This is the third addendum to the Environmental Report on the Sligo and Environs Development Plan 2010-2016 and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report. This document identifies the environmental consequences of relevant recommendations with regard to the adoption of Proposed Amendments contained in the Third Manager's Report.

As Addendum II to the Environmental Report identifies the environmental consequences of adopting the Proposed Amendments, the environmental consequences of recommendations to adopt the Amendments are not identified in this Addendum. Where the Manager has recommended that a Proposed Amendment should not be adopted or where the Manager has recommended that a Proposed Amendment should be modified, the environmental consequences of these recommendations are identified. Also identified are the environmental consequences of both the recommendation on Submission No. LSDP-5 and the Manager's Supplementary Recommendation No. 6.

Content of the Draft Plan which does not comprise policies or objectives is not within the scope of the SEA and therefore was not evaluated in the initial Environmental Report. Consequently Proposed Amendments to such content are not considered by this Addendum.

It should be noted that changes are not made to the original Environmental Report; this Addendum forms part of the documentation of the ongoing SEA/Plan-making process. It supplements and should be read in conjunction with the Environmental Report and Addendums I¹ and II².

The findings of this report will be used to update the Environmental Report on adoption of the Plan. The updated Environmental Report will be made available to the public and accompany the Sligo and Environs Development Plan when adopted.

1.2 Process for making a new Development Plan for Sligo and Environs

The consideration of both the Third Manager's Report and this Addendum to the Environmental Report by the Elected Members constitutes a further stage in the process of making a new Development Plan for Sligo and Environs.

Towards the beginning of the process, the Draft Plan and accompanying Environmental Report were put on public display. The Manager prepared a report on the submissions/observations received during this period and submitted it to the Elected Members for their consideration.

Having considered the Draft Plan, the Environmental Report and the Manager's Report, the Members of Sligo County Council and Sligo Borough Council, by resolution, resolved to amend the Draft Development Plan in accordance with the provisions set out in Section 12(6) of the Planning and Development Act 2000-2004.

The Proposed Amendments were placed on public display from 19 August to 16 September 2009 during which period submissions and observations were made on the environmental report. The Third Manager's Report summarises the issues raised in the submissions and gives the Manager's response to these

¹ Addendum I details responses to the submissions on the Environmental Report which were made during the first period of public display of the Draft Plan and the Environmental Report. Also provided are updates to the Environmental Report as a result of these submissions.

² Addendum II identifies the environmental consequences of relevant proposed amendments to the Draft Plan.

issues, including recommendations as to whether or not the Proposed Amendments to the Draft Plan should be adopted.

Having considered the Proposed Amendments, the Manager's recommendations on the issues raised and Addendums II and III to the Environmental Report, the Members will decide whether to adopt, to reject or to make minor modifications to the Proposed Amendments to the Draft Plan.

Note regarding text in the following section

The relevant Manager's Recommendations as contained in the Third Manager's Report are shown in black text.

Responses with regard to the environmental consequences of the changes are shown in green.

2 Environmental Consequences of Manager's Recommendations

2.1 Recommendations not to adopt Proposed Amendments

Proposed Amendment Number 3

The sentence "It is recognised that these constraints exist in Sligo" should be retained in Section 6.5.6 of the Draft SEDP".

This recommendation would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 11

The objective O-CF-1 to reserve a site at Carrowroe for the construction of a private hospital and ancillary facilities should not be adopted.

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of the environment and would prevent potential conflicts across a range of environmental topics including archaeological heritage, the landscape, architectural heritage, designated ecology, non-designated ecology, ecological connectivity, water resources, human health, and, flood risk.

Proposed Amendment Number 19

The proposed Addendum to Section 10.2.7 Objective T1.5.a Western/City Bypass should not be included in the Draft SEDP. The entire Section 10.2.7 should be deleted.

As the Proposed Amendment and Section 10.2.7 to which it relates restricts the investigation of alternative options as part of environmental related assessments of a possible City Bypass, this recommendation to remove the Proposed Amendment and Section 10.2.7 would contribute towards enabling the identification of a route which is most favourable with regard to the protection of the environment thereby potentially improving the status of environmental components.

Proposed Amendment Number 20

The text of objective T2.11 should be retained – (MSR)

As objective T2.11 provides for a road link which could potentially conflict with the protection of biodiversity and flora and fauna, water resources, cultural heritage and the landscape, this recommendation to retain the objective could potentially conflict with the protection of the environment. It is noted however that measures contained elsewhere in the draft Plan provide for the protection of the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 48

The water supply objective O-WS-4 should not pre-empt national policy regarding water pricing. The objective should be deleted in its entirety.

This recommendation would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 71

The zoning of the Shafin site at Orchard Road should not be changed from R3 to R2.

This recommendation would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 74

The zoning of the entire site at Drumaskibbole belonging to Declan O’Conor should revert to BUF/buffer zone.

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of the environment and would prevent potential conflicts across a range of environmental topics including water resources, the landscape, flood risk and non-designated flora and fauna.

Proposed Amendment Number 76

Zoning at Carrowroe should not be changed to CF/community facilities to allow for the construction of a private hospital and ancillary facilities.

This recommendation not to adopt the Proposed Amendment - which includes a change to the zoning map and the introduction of a new objective - would positively interact with the protection of the environment and would prevent potential conflicts across a range of environmental topics including human health, designated ecology, non-designated ecology, ecological connectivity, water resources, flood risk, cultural heritage and the landscape.

Proposed Amendment Number 82

The zoning of the site at Rathbraughan Line belonging to Dick Chambers should remain OS/open space.

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of the environment and would prevent potential conflicts across a range of environmental topics including water resources, the landscape, flood risk and non-designated flora and fauna.

Proposed Amendment Number 86

The line of objective T1.5 at Carrowroe and Oakfield should be retained.

As objective T1.5 provides for a road link which could potentially conflict with the protection of biodiversity and flora and fauna, water resources, cultural heritage and the landscape, this recommendation to retain the line of objective T1.5 between Carraroe and Oakfield could potentially conflict with the protection of the environment. It is noted however that measures contained elsewhere in the draft Plan provide for the protection of the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 87

The line of objective T2.11 should be retained on Map 2 Transport objectives.

See response under *Proposed Amendment 20*.

Proposed Amendment Number 91

No objective O-CF-1 to reserve a site at Carrowroe for the construction of a private hospital and ancillary facilities should be indicated on Map 4 General objectives.

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of the environment and would prevent potential conflicts across a range of environmental topics including archaeological heritage, the landscape, architectural heritage, designated ecology, non-designated ecology, ecological connectivity, water resources, human health, and, flood risk.

Proposed Amendment Number 125

Ozanam House (Draft RPS item no. 96) should be protected in its entirety, not “façade-only”

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of architectural heritage.

2.2 Recommendations to Modify Proposed Amendments

Proposed Amendment Number 5

The retail policy P-RP-13 should allow a maximum of 30% of the net floor space of any individual warehousing unit to be used for the sale of comparison goods ancillary/related to the main bulky products.

This recommendation would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 24

The text of Section 10.4 A Pedestrian-friendly city centre should be retained unchanged, as originally included in the Draft SEDP, except for objectives O-PED-1 and O-PED-2, which should be modified to remove conditionality.

Objectives which would be provided by Proposed Amendment

- O-PED-1 Pedestrianise O’Connell Street when the necessary funding to cover the costs of the pedestrianisation and enhancement of the street is provided by Government or other sources, and when the Borough Council by resolution deems it appropriate.
- O-PED-2 Continue the pedestrian prioritisation and environmental improvements of the City Centre to include Castle Street, Grattan Street, Market Street, High street and John Street, when funding becomes available and when the Borough Council by resolution deems it appropriate.

Objectives which would be provided by Manager’s Recommendation for Modification

- O-PED-1 - Pedestrianise and environmentally enhance O’Connell Street
- O-PED-2 - Continue the pedestrian prioritisation and environmental improvements of the City Centre to include Castle Street, Grattan Street, Market Street, High Street and John Street

As the objectives provided for by the Proposed Amendment would be likely to inhibit efforts to minimise increases in travel related greenhouse emissions to air and reduce car dependency within the Plan area, this recommendation to modify the Proposed Amendment - by retaining original narrative and removing conditionality from objectives - would improve such efforts.

Proposed Amendment Number 63

The title and text of Section 16.8 should be modified to reflect the fact that certain development management requirements relating to access would apply to the entire roads network and not only to national roads.

This recommendation would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment.

Proposed Amendment Number 135

The Proposed Amendment no. 135 should be modified to retain the structure at No. 17 High Street on the RPS while including the correct photographic record and changing the description to read "terraced two-bay, two storey rendered property, formerly a single property together with No. 16 High Street".

This recommendation would positively interact with the protection of architectural heritage.

2.3 Recommendation on Submission No. LSDP-5 and Manager's Supplementary Recommendation No. 6

Recommendation on Submission No. LSDP-5

- A. Clarify the text of policy P-BH-20 by replacing the "historic buildings" with "structures of architectural heritage merit".
- B. When incorporating the contents of 13.2.5 in the relevant subsections of Section 13.2, omit the reference to the "Venice Charter and subsequent ICOMOS Charters" and replace "highest conservation standards" with "a high conservation standard".
- C. When incorporating the policy 13.2.5.B in the relevant subsection of Section 13.2, replace the words "accredited conservation architect" by "RIAI-accredited architect or practice (or foreign equivalent for non-Irish architects or practices)" and insert the following explanatory footnote: To assist clients in the selection of a practice able to provide them with professional services in architectural conservation, the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland (RIAI) developed an accreditation system to recognise differing levels of specialist expertise. There are three grades of accreditation, Grade I being the highest and Grade III the basic entry level to the system. Detailed information can be found on the website of the RIAI at www.riai.ie.

These recommendations would provide greater clarity to the measures incorporated into the draft Plan however they would be unlikely to significantly interact with the environment. If adopted, the recommendations will be incorporated into the Environmental Report.

Manager’s Supplementary Recommendation No. 6

In Chapter 16, subsection 16.6.2 Entrances should be updated by including the following text:

The minimum sight distance required for entrances onto roads shall be in accordance with the NRA Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, which are broadly as follows:

Speed of major road (km/h)	Sight distance required (m)
42	50
50	70
60	90
70	120
85	160
100	215

The guidance provided for this Development Management Standard would be likely to positively interact with the protection of human health.