

**Third Chief Executive's Report**  
**on submissions and observations**  
**on the proposed amendments**  
**of the Draft CDP 2017-2023**



# Contents

<b>Section 1</b>	
Consultation on proposed amendments	1
<b>Section 2</b>	
Recommendations on proposed amendments to Volume 1 of the Draft CDP 2017-2023	5
<b>Section 3</b>	
Recommendations on proposed amendments to Volume 2 of the Draft CDP 2017-2023	29
<b>Section 4</b>	
Recommendations on proposed amendments to the Record of Protected Structures	39
<b>Appendix 1</b>	
Modified Table 13.A	55
<b>Appendix 2</b>	
List of persons and organisations that made submissions on the proposed amendments to the RPS and Draft CDP 2017-2023	57



## Section 1. Consultation on the Proposed Amendments

The Proposed Amendments to the Draft *Sligo County Development Plan 2017-2023* (CDP) were on public display from 11 May 2017 to 21 June 2017.

The Proposed Amendments included 77 material changes to Volume 1 (main document) of the Draft CDP, 45 changes to Volume 2 (Mini-plans), 30 changes to the Record of Protected Structures, four changes to the Environmental Report and one change to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

During the public consultation period, Sligo County Council received 25 submissions and observations. On receipt, submissions were allocated reference numbers in the order in which they were received. The list of submissions is enclosed at the end of the Report, in Appendix 2.

There were two different submissions received from the Department of Education and Skills (Submission 1 and 17). Both submissions stated that this department had no comments on the proposed amendments.

Twelve submissions made comments on the proposed amendments to Vol. 1 of the Draft CDP. Five submissions commented on proposed amendments to Volume 2 of the Draft Plan. Four submissions related to proposed amendments to the RPS.

### 1.1 Submission received from the Department of Housing, Planning, Communities and Local Government (DHPCLG)

- The Department of HPCLG (Submission no. 14) welcomes the insertion of the Sligo and Environs Plan as an appendix to the Sligo County Development Plan 2017-2023 (proposed amendment A-A-2).
- The proposed amendment A-3-4, relating to bonds (in Section 3.7.3) is acknowledged.
- The Department recommends that the final Plan be updated with 2016 Census data in relation to housing vacancy. While this recommendation is not related to any proposed amendment, it can be implemented, as it would involve only minor modifications. The population and housing figures in the Draft CDP 2017-2023 will be updated before publishing the adopted CDP.
- The Department restates the opinion that Section **11.1.10 Unconventional gas exploration and extraction (UGEE)** should be omitted from the final Plan. This does not relate to any proposed amendment and cannot be considered at this stage.
- The DHPCLG recommends that reference should be made to Circular PL 2/2017 – Local Needs Criteria in Development Plans, issued on 31 March 2017, which advises planning authorities that the 2005 Rural Housing Guidelines remain in place pending relevant updates arising from the local needs case at EU level and which are being addressed by a Department-led working group. This issue is addressed in the Chief Executive’s recommendation relating to the proposed amendments A-5-2 and A-5-3.
- The Department notes the proposed deletions from the RPS and advises Sligo County Council to “carefully consider the merits of such deletions paying close attention to any comments and observations made by the Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltach Affairs”. While no submission was received from the DAHRRGA, the Chief Executive has made appropriate recommendations regarding all proposed amendments which involve the deletion of structures currently included on the RPS.

## 1.2 Submissions not related to the proposed amendments

The third stage of public consultation relates **exclusively** to the proposed amendments. Changes requested in previous submissions (relating to the Draft Plan) which have not been accepted by the Members and were not put on public display as proposed amendments, cannot be reconsidered at this stage. No additional policies or zoning may be proposed before making the Plan.

The following submissions made no comments on any of the proposed amendments to the Draft Plan, referring instead to issues that are NOT the subject of proposed amendments:

Submission no. 2 – Irish Natura and Hill Farmers Association

Submission no. 4 – Michael and Mary McGoldrick

Submission no. 8 – Martin A. Timoney and Mary B. Timoney

Submission no. 12 – Edward Walsh and Constance Cassidy

Submission no. 20 – Ciara Mc Hugh

Submission no. 25 – John and Maura O'Connor

## 1.3 How the Chief Executive's Report is organised

This **Third Chief Executive's Report** lists each proposed amendment, summarises the relevant issues raised in submissions and gives the Chief Executive's response to these issues, including recommendations as to whether the proposed amendments should be adopted or not.

The Chief Executive's opinion and recommendations relate exclusively to the **proposed amendments**. Issues raised in submissions are summarised and addressed only insofar as they relate to proposed amendments. Unrelated issues are not addressed, as they are not relevant to decision-making in this final stage of the Development Plan process.

**Section 2** of this Report lists the proposed amendments to Volume 1 of the Draft Plan and indicates the Chief Executive's recommendation regarding each amendment.

**Section 3** lists the proposed amendments to Volume 2 of the Draft Plan and indicates the Chief Executive's recommendation regarding each amendment.

**Section 4** lists the proposed amendments to the RPS and indicates the Chief Executive's recommendation regarding each amendment.

Where the Chief Executive recommends minor modifications to the text of any proposed amendments, these are shown in **green type like this**.

All modifications recommended by the Chief Executive are minor and do not represent material changes of the proposed amendments.

## 1.4 The role of the elected members

Deciding whether to adopt, to reject or to make minor modifications to the proposed amendments to the Draft Plan is a function reserved for the elected members of Sligo County Council.

The third stage of public consultation related exclusively to the proposed amendments. No additional policies or zoning may be proposed at this stage. No policies or zoning can be removed from the Plan, unless this was proposed in an amendment that was subject to public consultation.

At this stage, the members are required to consider the Proposed Amendments and the Chief Executive’s recommendations contained in this Report. According to Section 12 (10)(a) and (c) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended):

- (a) The members of the authority shall, by resolution, having considered the manager’s report, make the plan with or without the proposed amendment that would, if made, be a material alteration, except that where they decide to accept the amendment they may do so subject to any modifications to the amendments as they consider appropriate, which may include the making of a further modification to the alteration and paragraph (c) shall apply in relation to any further modification.

...

- (c) A further modification to the alteration—
  - (i) may be made where it is minor in nature and therefore not likely to have significant effects on the environment or adversely affect the integrity of a European site,
  - (ii) shall not be made where it relates to—
    - (I) an increase in the area of land zoned for any purpose, or
    - (II) an addition to or deletion from the record of protected structures.

Furthermore,

“In making the development plan ... the members shall be restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to which the development plan relates, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or any minister of the Government.” (S. 12 (11))

### 1.5 What happens next

Once the County Council has made the development plan, it has to notify the public, the Minister for Housing, Planning Community and Local Government, the prescribed authorities, the adjoining planning authorities, the Board (An Bord Pleanála) and the Local Community Development Committee (LCDC). A copy of the development plan must be made available for inspection at stated places.

The owners or occupiers of structures added or deleted from the Record of Protected Structures must also be notified.

The new Development Plan will have effect four weeks from the day that it is made, unless the Minister considers that Section 31 of the Planning and Development Act (as amended in 2010) is applicable.

Section 31(1) indicates what happens if the Plan is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act or if the planning authority has not take sufficient account of the Minister’s submissions:

Where the Minister is of the opinion that—

- (a) a planning authority, in making a development plan, a variation of a development plan, or a local area plan (in this section referred to as a ‘plan’) has ignored, or has not taken sufficient account of submissions or observations made by the Minister to the planning authority under section 12, 13 or 20,

- (b) in the case of a plan, the plan fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area,
- (c) the plan is not in compliance with the requirements of this Act, or
- (d) if applicable, having received a submission prepared under section 31C or 31D (inserted by section 95 of the Act of 2008) that a plan of a planning authority in the Greater Dublin Area (GDA) is not consistent with the transport strategy of the National Transport Authority,

the Minister may in accordance with this section, for stated reasons, direct a planning authority to take such specified measures as he or she may require in relation to that plan.

## Section 2. Recommendations on proposed amendments to Volume 1 of the Draft Plan

The Chief Executive’s opinion and recommendations made on the following pages relate to the **proposed amendments only**. Issues raised in submissions are summarised and addressed only insofar as they relate to proposed amendments. Unrelated issues are not addressed, as they are not relevant to decision-making in this final stage of the Development Plan process.

Where a submission (or more) was received in relation to a proposed amendment, the name of the author is given, along with a brief summary of the comments relating to the proposed amendment. This is followed by the Chief Executive’s recommendation.

If no submission was received in relation to a proposed amendment, and there is no concern raised by the Chief Executive, this is indicated in the right-hand column, together with the Chief Executive’s recommendation to adopt the proposed amendment.

Whether or not submissions were received in relation to a proposed amendment, where the Chief Executive has concerns, these are stated immediately below the respective proposed amendment, followed by the appropriate recommendation.

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Throughout the Plan</b>	
<b>A-0-1</b> Throughout the final Plan, replace ‘ <i>Habitats Directive Assessment</i> ’ with <b>Appropriate Assessment</b> and ‘ <i>Natura 2000 sites</i> ’ with <b>European Sites</b> , where appropriate.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 2. Strategic Environmental Assessment</b>	
<b>A-2-1</b> In the final Plan, change the name of <b>Chapter 2 (Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA))</b> to <b>Chapter 2 (Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA))</b> , and insert a subsection summarising the appropriate assessment process and its conclusion.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendments should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-2-2</b> In <b>Section 2.4</b> of the final Plan, include a brief summary of the EPA scoping submission received at pre-draft stage.	
<b>A-2-3</b> In the final Plan, add a subsection summarising the key outputs from the SEA, Appropriate Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment processes which influenced the Plan policies and objectives.	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 3. Core Strategy</b>	
<p><b>A-3-1</b> In the introduction to <b>Chapter 3 County Sligo: Core Strategy</b>, insert and <b>highlight</b> the following text after the last paragraph on p. 15 of the Draft Plan:</p> <p><b>All the policies and objectives for development contained in Volume 1 and Volume 2 of this Plan are subject to compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Directive and, where relevant, those of the Birds Directive, EIA directive and relevant national legislation.</b></p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-3-2</b> In <b>Section 3.5 Local area plans</b> (p. 30 of the Draft Plan), include additional text explaining the requirement to comply with Section 10(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended by the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015) relating to areas in need of regeneration and insert the following:</p> <p><b>Urban regeneration objective</b></p> <p>It is an objective of Sligo County Council to:</p> <p><b>O-REG-1</b> Identify areas in need of regeneration in Sligo City and, if appropriate, in the Key Support Towns of Ballymote, Enniscrone and Tobercurry, as part of the process of review or preparation of the respective local area plans.</p>	<p>The <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-3-3</b> In <b>Section 3.6 Miscellaneous zoning provisions</b>, subsection <b>Strategic zoning policies</b> (p. 32 of the Draft CDP), modify <b>SP-Z-4</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SP-Z-4</b> On lands included in the Strategic Land Reserve, permit the development of the following, insofar as they do not adversely impact on the potential for comprehensive and co-ordinated development of surrounding lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– individual houses for landowners, including their sons and daughters, who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their principal family residence where they have lived for a minimum period of seven years;</li> </ul>	<p>This proposed amendment is supported by <b>Walter and Margaret Burke (Submission 11)</b>.</p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- social and special-needs housing;</li> <li>- community facilities and other non-residential developments compatible with residential uses;</li> <li>- housing on residentially zoned lands adjacent to existing residential development within the Sligo and Environs Plan area where the land is adequately serviced;</li> <li>-- student accommodation.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The forthcoming Sligo and Environs Local Area Plan is the most appropriate instrument for deciding the location and amount of additional housing land that is to be excluded from the Strategic Land Reserve. The Planning Section intends to carry out extensive public consultation in this regard, in order to ascertain the views and needs of all sectors of the local community, including landowners.</p> <p>While there is no objection to the proposal to permit the development of student accommodation on lands included in the Strategic Land Reserve, it is considered that the general reference to “housing on residentially zoned lands adjacent to existing residential development” should be <b>omitted</b> from the amendment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment <b>A-3-3</b> should be <b>ADOPTED</b> in the following form:</p> <p><b>A-3-3</b> In <b>Section 3.6 Miscellaneous zoning provisions</b>, subsection <b>Strategic zoning policies</b> (p. 32 of the Draft CDP), modify <b>SP-Z-4</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>SP-Z-4</b> On lands included in the Strategic Land Reserve, permit the development of the following, insofar as they do not adversely impact on the potential for comprehensive and co-ordinated development of surrounding lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- individual houses for landowners, including their sons and daughters, who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their principal family residence where they have lived for a minimum period of seven years;</li> <li>- social and special-needs housing;</li> <li>- community facilities and other non-residential developments compatible with residential uses;</li> <li>-- student accommodation.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>A-3-4</b> In <b>Section 3.7 Implementation</b>, subsection <b>3.7.3 Bonds</b> (p. 34 of the Draft CDP), modify the text to make it in accordance with the requirements set out in the Department’s Circular Letter PL 11.2013.</p>	<p>The <b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (Submission 14)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-3-5</b> In <b>Section 3.7.5 Monitoring and reporting</b> of the final Plan (see renumbering indicated under <b>A 3-6</b>), include a reference to the monitoring measures described in Section 10 of the Environmental Report and summarised in Table 10.1 of the ER</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-3-6</b> In <b>Section 3.7 Implementation</b> (p. 34 of the Draft Plan), insert a new subsection containing details on the vacant site levy.</p>	<p>The <b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (Submission 14)</b> and the <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> support this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 4. Economic development</b>	
<p><b>A-4-1</b> In <b>Section 4.3 Rural Development and enterprise, subsection Rural development and diversification policies</b> (p. 42 of the Draft Plan), include an additional <b>policy</b>, as follows:</p> <p><b>P-RDD-5</b> Encourage the growth or expansion of existing rural based small-scale industry and enterprise in rural County Sligo.</p>	<p><b>The Environmental Protection Agency (Submission 3)</b> endorses the recommendations of the SEA Addendum in relation to this proposed amendment. The EPA suggests replacing the word “<i>Encourage</i>” with “<i>Support</i>” and placing the word “<i>sustainable</i>” before “<i>growth</i>”.</p> <p><b>Transport Infrastructure Ireland (Submission 7)</b> suggests that this additional policy should make reference to the proposed policy P-NR-1 (National roads policies).</p> <p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>Eamonn Prenter (Cunnane Stratton Reynolds) on behalf of The Irish Natura &amp; Hill Farmers Association (Submission 15)</b> requests that P-RDD-5 be modified to include the words ‘<i>or well established</i>’ after ‘<i>existing rural based</i>’. The INHFA has no objection to inclusion of the additional mitigating text to this policy, as recommended in the SEA Addendum.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The <b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Addendum</b> prepared in conjunction with the <b>Proposed Amendments</b> document has highlighted the potential for negative environmental impacts if this amendment is adopted in its current form. The SEA Addendum states the following:</p> <p><i>The expansion of existing rural-based small-scale enterprises could potentially have negative impacts on designated natural heritage sites (SACs, SPAs), on other important habitats, on human health and residential amenity, on archaeological and architectural heritage, on landscape, could involve loss of agricultural land, potential contamination of soil, surface waters and groundwater.</i></p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><i>Existing enterprises that are not appropriate to a rural location would be encouraged to expand, with a potentially wide range of negative consequences, if this amendment is adopted in the proposed form.</i></p> <p><i>In order to avoid or mitigate any potential negative impact on the environment, the following paragraph should be added to the proposed policy (similar to the text included in policy P-RDD-1):</i></p> <p><i>Where an existing rural-based enterprise proposes to expand in its current location, it will be necessary to demonstrate that such expansion can be accommodated without damage to the environment, natural or built heritage, human health, visual and residential amenity, and that it will not have a negative impact on the character of the area.</i></p> <p>It is noted that the EPA endorses the additional text recommended in the SEA Addendum (text in green above).</p> <p><b>In response to the TII submission:</b> Specific reference to the proposed policy P-NR-1 is not considered necessary in the text of proposed policy P-RDD-5. Any development along national roads must have regard to the proposed <b>national roads policies set out in the proposed amendment A-8-5</b> and to <b>Section 13.8.1 Access onto national roads</b>.</p> <p><b>In response to the EPA submission:</b> There is no objection to replacing the word 'encourage' with 'support' and to the inclusion of the word 'sustainable'.</p> <p><b>In response to the INHFA submission:</b> The inclusion of the wording "well established" in P-RDD-5 is not considered necessary, because the wording "existing rural based enterprises" includes both well-established businesses and younger enterprises established in rural areas.</p> <p>The recommendations of the EPA and those contained in the SEA Addendum represent minor modifications, which do not materially alter the proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment <b>A-4-1</b> should be <b>ADOPTED</b> with the following minor modifications (shown in <b>green</b>):</p> <p><b>P-RDD-5</b>     <b>Support the sustainable growth or expansion of existing rural based small-scale industry and enterprise in rural County Sligo.</b></p> <p><b>Where an existing rural-based enterprise proposes to expand in its current location, it will be necessary to demonstrate that such expansion can be accommodated without damage to the environment, natural or built heritage, human health, visual and residential amenity, and that it will not have a negative impact on the character of the area.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-4-2</b> In <b>Section 4.4 Tourism</b>, subsection <b>Wild Atlantic Way Objectives</b> (p. 53 of the Draft Plan), include an additional <b>objective</b>, as follows:</p> <p><b>O-WAW-4</b> Monitor the future development of the County's section of the Wild Atlantic Way touring route to ensure that the scenic and tourism value of this important amenity is maintained. This will be done in co-operation with state agencies, local community groups and other bodies interested in protecting the coastal environment and in improving access and visitor management to the Wild Atlantic Way.</p>	<p>The <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-4-3</b> In <b>Section 4.4. Tourism Development</b>, modify <b>Section 4.4.2 Trends and assumptions for the future</b> (p. 47 of the Draft Plan) by updating the numbers of tourist accommodation premises.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-4-4</b> Modify <b>Box 4.D</b> in <b>Section 4.4.5 Cultural tourism</b> (p. 50 of the Draft CDP) by adding another potential project:</p> <p>Spanish Armada Visitor Centre - Conservation, management and interpretation of the Spanish Armada wrecks site at Streedagh and development of a visitor centre.</p>	<p>The <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 5. Housing</b>	
<p><b>A-5-1</b> In <b>Section In Section 5.3 Housing in rural areas</b> (p. 72 of the Draft Plan), modify the text of subsection <b>5.3.1 Rural housing policy areas</b> by clarifying the criteria for assessing applications.</p>	<p><b>Transport Infrastructure Ireland (Submission 7)</b> acknowledges the inclusion of a reference to <b>Section 13.4</b> and suggests a cross reference with Section 8.2.1, in particular to Policy P-NR-1.</p> <p><b>Response to TII submission:</b> Specific reference to the proposed policy P-NR-1 is not considered necessary in the text of the proposed rural housing policies.</p> <p>Any development along national roads must have regard to the <b>national roads policies set out in the proposed amendment A-8-5</b> and to <b>Section 13.8.1 Access onto national roads</b>.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED without further modifications.</b></p>
<p><b>A-5-2</b> In <b>Section 5.3 Housing in rural areas</b>, modify the text of the subsection on <b>Housing policy in Rural Areas under Urban Influence</b> (p. 73 of the Draft Plan) by removing temporal and spatial constraints and by adding “<b>AND where such persons can demonstrate that the home they propose is in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area</b>”.</p>	<p>The <b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (Submission 14)</b> recommends that reference should be made to Circular PL 2/2017 – <i>Local Needs Criteria in Development Plans</i>, which was issued by the Department on 31 May 2017. This Circular advises planning authorities that the 2005 Rural Housing Guidelines remain in place pending relevant updates currently being addressed by a Department-led working group.</p>
<p><b>A-5-3</b> In <b>Section 5.3 Housing in rural areas</b>, modify the text of the subsection on <b>Housing policy in green belts and sensitive landscapes</b> by removing temporal and spatial constraints and by adding “<b>AND where such persons can demonstrate that the home they propose is in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area</b>”.</p>	<p>The <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> notes the proposed amendments and recommends that they should be reviewed to ensure consistency with Circular PL 2/2017.</p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>Section 5.3 <b>Housing in rural areas</b> (p. 72 of the Draft Plan) indicates that government policy on rural housing is set out in the <i>Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines</i> (2005). The Circular PL 2/2017 advises that these Guidelines remain in place, pending the conclusion of the policy review process. There is no conflict between the Draft Plan or the proposed amendments and the Guidelines or the Circular Letter.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the rural housing policy are fully compliant with the provisions of the Guidelines, which do not specify any temporal or spatial criteria to be satisfied by applicants for housing in rural areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments A-5-2 and A-5-3 should be <b>ADOPTED without further modifications.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-5-4</b> Modify the title of <b>Section 5.5</b> (p.79 of the Draft Plan) as follows:</p> <p><b>Section 5.5</b> <del>Special-needs housing</del> <b>Housing for persons with diverse needs</b></p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-5-5</b> Modify <b>Section 5.5.2</b> (p.79 of the Draft Plan) of the Draft Plan by updating the information on the Strategic Plan for Housing People with a Disability.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-5-6</b> In <b>Section 5.6 Miscellaneous housing provisions</b>, subsection <b>5.6.1 Holiday homes and second homes</b> (p. 81 of the Draft CDP), add the following policy:</p> <p><b>P-HSH-4</b> Ensure that new holiday home developments are constructed to the standards and specifications applicable to housing intended for permanent occupation. Exceptions may be made for specific types of holiday accommodation designed exclusively for short-term occupation by tourists (e.g. apart-hotels, chalets etc.)</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-5-7</b> In <b>Section 5.6 Miscellaneous housing provisions</b>, subsection <b>5.6.2 Derelict houses</b> (p. 82-83 of the Draft CDP), modify policy <b>P-DHOU-1</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-DHOU-1</b> Encourage the renovation and reuse of existing derelict houses and consider proposals for replacement houses on their merits. The structures proposed for replacement should generally be intact and exhibit the main characteristics of a dwelling. The location, siting and design of any such replacement house shall reflect those</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p>of the existing derelict dwelling. <i>Where historic or vernacular buildings are located on the site, consideration should be given to their retention or incorporation into any proposed development.</i></p>	
<b>Chapter 6. Community facilities</b>	
<p><b>A-6-1</b> In <b>Section 6.4 Arts and cultural facilities</b> (p. 90 of the Draft Plan), insert a subsection on public libraries.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-6-2</b> In <b>Section 6.4 Arts and cultural facilities</b>, add the following policies:</p> <p><b>P-AC-3</b> Support the improvement of library facilities and services, particularly in those communities which have undergone rapid increases in population or designated for future development.</p> <p><b>P-AC-4</b> Support the delivery of the objectives and actions set out in the Sligo Library Service Plan 2017-2022 in providing community-based educational, cultural and lifelong learning centres.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-6-3</b> In <b>Section 6.6. Healthcare facilities</b> (p. 92 of the Draft CDP), modify policy <b>P-HC-3</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-HC-3</b> Support the provision of healthcare services <i>and universally accessible</i> facilities for people with <i>learning</i> all types of disabilities and special needs, <i>in accordance with the recommended standards set out in Building for everyone – a Universal Design Approach (NDA, 2012).</i></p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-6-4</b> In <b>Section 6.7 Outdoor recreation</b>, subsection <b>6.7.4 Outdoor recreational amenities</b> (p. 94 of the Draft CDP), add relevant text and a table under the heading <b>Public rights of way</b>.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>Edward Walsh and Constance Cassidy (Submission 13)</b> acknowledge the receipt of the notice and list a number of items to be included in the wording of the Development Plan in respect of PROW 1.</p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>It is agreed to include a note clarifying the start and end points of PROW 1, as well as the conditions of passing and repassing across the route of PROW 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-6-4 should be <b>ADOPTED</b> subject to the indication of the coordinates of the start and end points of PROW 1, together with a note worded as follows:</p> <p><b>In accordance with Supreme Court Rulings No. 89 and 92 of 2011:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A right of way exists between point A (Easting 162505.674, Northing 344090.033) and point B (Easting 162261.274, Northing 344008.744)</b> (Note: in the final version of the new CDP, the map illustrating this ROW will be amended by marking the two ends of the route with the letters A and B)</li> <li>• <b>There is no right of parking off the route of PROW 1;</b></li> <li>• <b>The right to pass and repass the nine-foot avenue does not extend to the lawns, gardens or any other land on either side of the right of way.</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>A-6-5</b> In <b>Section 6.7 Outdoor recreation</b>, subsection <b>6.7.4 Outdoor recreational amenities</b> (p. 94-95 of the Draft Plan), insert a subsection explaining the nature of <b>Permissive Trails</b>.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> and the <b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (Submission 14)</b> support this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-6-6</b> In <b>Section 6.7 Outdoor recreation</b>, subsection <b>Section 6.7.4 Outdoor recreational policies</b> (p. 97 of the Draft CDP), amend <b>P-OR-14</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-OR-14</b> Preserve and improve access for the public to lakes, <b>beaches</b>, coastal, riverside, upland and other areas that have traditionally been used for outdoor recreation, subject to compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Directive.</p> <p><i>Where feasible, apply or support the application of universal design principles, as recommended in <b>Building for everyone – a Universal Design Approach (NDA, 2012)</b>.</i></p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-6-7</b> In <b>Section 6.7 Outdoor recreation</b>, subsection <b>6.7.4 Outdoor recreational amenities</b>, insert the following outdoor recreation policy after P-OR-14 (all subsequent policies will be renumbered in the final version of the CDP):</p> <p><b>P-OR-15</b> Support the sustainable development of water-based leisure, tourism and related activities in County Sligo, subject to compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Directive.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 7. Heritage</b>	
<p><b>A-7-1</b> In <b>Chapter 7 Heritage</b>, subsection <b>Heritage - general objectives</b>, add the following general heritage objective:</p> <p><b>O-H-3</b> Prepare and support the implementation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy for County Sligo, as resources allow.</p> <p>and insert a footnote including the definition of “green infrastructure”.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> suggests removing the words ‘as resources allow’ from O-H-3 and amending the footnote to include the term ‘quality of life’.</p> <p>The <b>EPA (Submission 3)</b> supports the proposed amendment.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The preparation of a ‘Green Infrastructure Strategy’ may require both internal and external resources. At present, there are no guarantees that such resources will be available within specified timescales, therefore it is considered appropriate to retain the caveat ‘as resources allow’ at the end of proposed objective O-H-3.</p> <p>The definition of “green infrastructure” included in the footnote was quoted from a European Commission document entitled <i>Green Infrastructure for Europe</i> (2013). This definition does not include the wording ‘quality of life’ and therefore its insertion is not considered appropriate or relevant.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-7-1 should be <b>ADOPTED without further modifications.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-7-2</b> In <b>Section 7.1 Natural heritage and biodiversity</b>, subsection <b>7.1.1. Designated sites for nature conservation</b> (p. 103 of the Draft Plan), modify the text of policy <b>P-DSNC-3</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-DSNC-3</b> Carry out an appropriate level of assessment for all development plans, land-use plans and projects <del>that the Council</del> authorizes or proposes to undertake or adopt, to determine the potential for these plans/projects to impact on designated sites, or proposed designated sites, in accordance with the Habitats Directive. All appropriate assessments shall be in compliance with the provisions of Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000.</p>	<p>The <b>EPA (Submission 3)</b> suggests that Policy P-DSNC-3 should include a reference to the protection of ecological corridors and linkages that are associated with designated sites.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>It is agreed to include the suggested reference as a minor modification, which would not represent a material change of the proposed amendment. It is considered that this wording represents a clarification of the policy intent.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p>The proposed amendment A-7-2 should be <b>ADOPTED</b> in the following form:</p> <p><b>P-DSNC-3</b> Carry out an appropriate level of assessment for all development plans, land-use plans and projects <b>that the Council</b> authorizes or proposes to undertake or adopt, to determine the potential for these <b>plans/projects</b> to impact on designated sites, proposed designated sites, <b>or associated ecological corridors and linkages</b>, in accordance with the Habitats Directive. <b>All appropriate assessments shall be in compliance with the provisions of Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-7-3</b> In <b>Section 7.1 Natural heritage and biodiversity</b>, subsection <b>7.1.5 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows</b> (p. 108-109 of the Draft CDP), make the following changes:</p> <p><b>7.1.5 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows</b></p> <p>Hedgerows constitute an important natural and historic resource, given their contribution to landscape quality, their ecological importance as wildlife habitats, <b>corridors between habitats</b> and historical significance as townland and field boundaries. <b>Hedgerows are afforded protection under the Wildlife (Amendment) Act, 2000, which prohibits the cutting of hedges during the bird nesting period (1st March to 1st September).</b></p> <p><b>Woodlands, trees and hedgerows policies</b></p> <p>It is the policy of Sligo County Council to:</p> <p><b>P-WTH-1</b> Protect trees, woodlands and hedgerows from development that would impact adversely upon them. Promote new tree and woodland planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows by seeking increased coverage, in conjunction with new development <b>using native species of local provenance, where possible.</b></p> <p><b>P-WTH-2</b> <b>Discourage the felling of mature trees to facilitate development and</b>, where appropriate, make use of tree preservation orders to protect important trees and groups of trees which may be at risk or have an important amenity or historic value.</p> <p><b>P-WTH-3</b> <b>Require the planting of native broadleaved species, and species of local provenance, in new developments.</b></p> <p><b>P-WTH-4</b> <b>Promote the planting of native tree and shrub species by committing to using native species (of local provenance wherever possible) in its landscaping works and on County Council property.</b></p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-7-4</b> In <b>Section 7.1 Natural heritage and biodiversity</b>, subsection <b>7.1.6 Inland waters</b>, add the following text to Inland waters policy <b>P-INW-1</b> (p. 110 of the Draft Plan):</p> <p><b>P-INW-1</b> Protect rivers, streams and other water courses and their associated Core riparian Zones (CRZ) from inappropriate development and maintain them in an open state, capable of providing suitable habitats for fauna and flora. Structures (e.g. bridges) crossing fisheries waters shall be clear-span and shall be designed and built in consultation with Inland Fisheries Ireland.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-7-5</b> In <b>Section 7.3 Architectural Heritage</b>, subsection <b>7.3.2 Protection of non-habitable structures</b> (p. 120 of the Draft CDP), insert additional text listing items of street furniture which are part of the built and cultural heritage.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-7-6</b> In <b>Section 7.3 Architectural Heritage</b>, subsection <b>7.3.4 Town and village streetscapes</b> (p. 120 of the Draft CDP), insert additional text defining vernacular built heritage.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-7-7</b> In <b>Section 7.3 Architectural heritage</b>, add the following Architectural heritage policies:</p> <p><b>P-ARH-6</b> Promote the retention and re-use of the vernacular built heritage through increasing public awareness of its potential for re-use and its adaptability to change.</p> <p><b>P-ARH-7</b> When considering proposals to adapt vernacular buildings to meet contemporary living standards and needs, require applicants to apply the conservation principles and guidelines set out in the ICOMOS Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage (Mexico 1999) – refer to Appendix H of this Plan.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-7-8</b> In <b>Section 7.4 Landscape character</b>, subsection <b>7.4.3 Current knowledge and policy</b> (p. 124 of the Draft CDP), add clarifications to the definitions of Normal rural Landscapes and Scenic Routes.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-7-9</b> In <b>Section 7.4 Landscape character</b>, subsection <b>Landscape character assessment and protection policies</b> (p. 125 of the Draft CDP), amend policy <b>P-LCAP-1</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-LCAP-1</b> Protect the physical landscape, visual and scenic character of County Sligo and seek to preserve the <b>County's</b> landscape character. <del>by assessing all development proposals on the basis of the Landscape Characterisation Map.</del></p> <p>Planning applications that have the potential to impact significantly and adversely upon landscape character, <del>or scenic views</del> especially in <i>Sensitive Rural Landscapes, Visually Vulnerable Areas and along Scenic routes</i>, may be required to be accompanied by a visual impact assessment using agreed and appropriate viewing points and methods of assessment.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> suggests the deletion of the “last clause” in the first paragraph. The reason given is that "one of the main purposes of the Landscape Characterisation Map is to assist the Council in assessing the merit of planning applications".</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>It is presumed that Mr Garland supports the retention of the wording shown in red above.</p> <p>This wording was proposed for deletion because it suggests that the Landscape Characterisation Map is the only planning tool used in the assessment of planning applications with regard to their potential landscape impact. This is not the case, as there are <b>seven landscape character assessment and protection policies</b> that may be used in the assessment of planning applications, complemented by location, siting and design criteria specified in <b>Chapter 13. Development management standards</b>.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED without further modifications.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-7-10</b> In <b>Section 7.4 Landscape character</b>, subsection <b>Landscape character assessment and protection policies</b> (p. 125 of the Draft CDP), amend policy <b>P-LCAP-3</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>P-LCAP-3</b> Preserve the scenic views listed in <b>Appendix F and the distinctive visual character of designated Scenic Routes</b> by controlling development along <del>designated Scenic such</del> Routes and other roads, while facilitating developments that may be tied to a specific location or to the demonstrated needs of applicants to reside in a particular area.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
In all cases, strict location, siting and design criteria shall apply, as set out in <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b> (development management standards).	
<b>Chapter 8. Transport and mobility</b>	
<b>A-8-1</b> In <b>Section 8.1 National and regional transport policy</b> (p. 127 of the Draft Plan), insert reference to the <b>Spatial Planning and National Roads</b> guidance document.	<b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-8-2</b> In <b>Section 8.1 National and regional transport policy – Transport strategic policies</b> , add the following strategic transport policy (p. 129 of the Draft CDP):  <b>SP-TRA-8</b> Facilitate the roll-out of charging infrastructure for electric vehicles, in line with the <i>National Renewable Energy Action Plan's</i> target for 10% of Ireland's vehicles to be electric by 2020.	<b>SSE (Submission 6)</b> supports this proposed amendment.  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-8-3</b> In <b>Section 8.1 National and regional transport policy</b> , modify the text of objective <b>SO-TRA-3</b> as follows (p. 130 of the Draft CDP):  <b>SO-TRA-3</b> Initiate the preparation of a <i>Transportation Study for Sligo City &amp; Environs</i> <del>by Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII, previously NRA), the National Transportation Authority and the Department of Transport,</del> subject to available funding, and implement the recommendations of this Study subject to compliance with the Habitats Directive.	<b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-8-4</b> In <b>Section 8.2 Road network</b> , subsection <b>8.2.1 National primary and secondary roads</b> (p.132 of the Draft Plan), add clarification regarding national primary roads.	<b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-8-5</b> In <b>Section 8.2 Road network</b> , subsection <b>8.2.1 National primary and secondary roads</b> (p.132 of the Draft Plan), introduce a specific set of policies entitled <b>National roads policies</b> as follows:  <b>P-NR-1</b> Protect the traffic carrying capacity of national roads, the level of service they	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p>deliver and the period over which they continue to perform efficiently, by avoiding the creation of new access points or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses onto the N-4, N-15, N-16, N-17 and N-59 outside the 50 km/h speed limit, in accordance with the DoECLG's publication Spatial Planning and National Roads -Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012).</p> <p><b>P-NR-2</b> Protect the route corridors necessary for the construction of new roads or the upgrading of existing national roads in Sligo, in accordance with the DoECLG's publication Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012).</p> <p><b>P-NR-3</b> Apply the provisions of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DTTS, DECLG 2013) to all development along national roads inside the 60-km/h speed limit zones in towns and villages.</p> <p><b>P-NR-4</b> Maintain the national road network in accordance with the TII Pavement Asset Management System.</p> <p><b>P-NR-5</b> Permit direct access to zoned lands along national roads inside the 50 km/h speed limit subject to normal planning considerations. Within <b>transitional zones</b> (between 50 km/h and 60 km/h speed limiting signs), access may be permitted, but only in limited circumstances, where it is in the interest of facilitating orderly urban development, and subject to a road safety audit carried out in accordance with TII requirements.</p>	<p>The <b>TII (Submission 7)</b> welcomes the clarification provided by the inclusion of the proposed <b>national road policies</b>.</p> <p>In relation to proposed policy <b>P-NR-3</b>, the TII indicates that the application of DMURS to national roads inside 60 km/h speed limit areas requires the consent of the TII, which will consider such cases on an individual basis.</p> <p>A modification to the proposed wording of P-NR-3 is recommended as follows:</p> <p><i>Apply the provisions of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DTTS, DECLG 2013), in <b>exceptional circumstances</b>, to <del>all</del> development along national roads inside the 60-km/h speed limit zones in towns and villages, with the consent of TII. In all other circumstances on national roads, design standards in TII publications will apply.</i></p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The proposed modifications to P-NR-3 are acceptable and would represent a minor modification, not a material change of the proposed amendment A-8-5.</p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-8-5 should be <b>ADOPTED with the following modification to policy P-NR-3:</b></p> <p><b>P-NR-3</b> Apply the provisions of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DTTS, DECLG 2013), <b>in exceptional circumstances</b>, to <del>all</del> development along national roads inside the 60-km/h speed limit zones in towns and villages, <b>with the consent of TII. In all other circumstances on national roads, design standards in TII publications will apply.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-8-6</b> In subsection <b>National roads objectives</b> (p. 133 of the Draft CDP), delete objective <b>O-NR-3</b> (now proposed to be included as a policy under the <b>National Roads policies</b>).</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-8-7</b> In subsection <b>Non-national roads and bridges policies</b> (p. 135 of the Draft CDP), add the following policy:</p> <p><b>P-NNR-5</b> Upgrade roads, footpaths, car-parking areas and junctions within the County's towns and villages in accordance with the provisions of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DTTS, DECLG, 2013), subject to the availability of resources.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-8-8</b> In <b>Section 8.3 Cycle and pedestrian movements</b>, modify objective <b>O-CW-5</b> (p. 139 of the Draft Plan) as follows:</p> <p><b>O-CW-5</b> Seek the development of a footway and cycleway (greenway) on or alongside the <del>disused</del> closed railway line from <del>Claremorris to</del> Collooney to Bellaghy (Sligo/Mayo county boundary) insofar as such route does not compromise the reopening of the Western Rail Corridor, if reopening the railway line is deemed feasible'.</p>	<p><b>Roger Garland (Keep Ireland Open – Submission 5)</b> supports this proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-8-9</b> In <b>Section 8.3 Cycle and pedestrian movements</b>, modify the wording of <b>Objective O-CW-5</b> (p. 139 of the Draft Plan) by replacing "<del>disused</del> railway line" with "closed railway line".</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 9. Environmental infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>A-9-1</b> In <b>Section 9.5 Waste management</b> (p. 161 of the Draft Plan) insert a new subsection detailing the location and the current state of <b>Historic landfills</b> in Co. Sligo.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-9-2</b> In subsection <b>Waste management policies</b> (p.164 of the Draft CDP), include three additional waste management policies as follows:</p> <p><b>P-WM-6</b> Require any development proposals on known historic landfill sites or in their vicinity shall take into consideration the <i>EPA Code of Practice: Environmental Risk Assessment for Unregulated Waste Disposal Sites (April 2007)</i>. Where landfills meet the definition of a 'closed landfill', as set out in the <i>Waste Management (certification of historic unlicensed waste disposal and recovery activity) Regulations 2008</i> (S.I. No 524 of 2008), there will be a requirement for authorisation of the landfill by the EPA under those regulations.</p> <p><b>P-WM-7</b> Ensure that the zoning or the rezoning of known former landfill sites, as part of the preparation or review of local area plans, is the most appropriate having regard to the potential sensitivities of such lands.</p> <p><b>P-WM-8</b> Development proposals on brownfield sites – such as former petrol stations, fuel/chemical storage areas and similar sites – shall be required to undertake an assessment if the potential for contaminated materials, soils etc to be unearthed during demolition/construction works, and the associated environmental risks.</p> <p>Where any environmental risk is identified, appropriate investigations shall be undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any materials or contaminated soils on the proposed development sites.</p> <p>A site-specific remediation plan shall be prepared to ensure that the construction and operation phases of development do not result in risk to human health, water quality, biodiversity, fisheries, air quality etc.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-9-3</b> In <b>Section 9.5 Waste management</b> (p.161 of the Draft Plan), add the following waste management objective:</p> <p><b>O-WM-1</b> Ensure that the certification and remediation process of the known historic landfill at Finisklin is completed in accordance with the <i>EPA Code of Practice: Environmental Risk Assessment for Unregulated Waste Disposal Sites (April 2007)</i>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-9-4</b> Modify the text of <b>Table 9.C Wastewater treatment plants in County Sligo</b> (p. 151-157 of the Draft CDP) in accordance with the <b>updates</b> provided by Irish Water.</p>	<p><b>Irish Water (Submission 7)</b> provides an update on upgrade works included in its Capital Investment Plan 2017-2021.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>It is noted that Irish Water confirms the figures included in this proposed amendment in relation to the upgrades to wastewater treatment plants in Ballinacarrow, Ballinafad, Grange, Rosses Point, Tobercurry and Strandhill.</p> <p>In addition, IW provides the following updates (shown in green below):</p> <p><b>Mullaghmore</b></p> <p>Upgrade of the Mullaghmore WWTP is included in Irish Water’s Investment Plan 2017-2021. This project is at feasibility stage. <i>Design capacity of the upgraded plant to adequately serve the village and meet statutory requirements is to be determined.</i></p> <p><b>Ballymote</b></p> <p><i>Upgrade works to provide a 3,500 p.e. plant at the Ballymote WWTP is included in Irish Water’s Investment Plan for 2017-2021. (Note: the figure contained in the Draft Plan is 3,000 p.e.)</i></p> <p><b>Collooney</b></p> <p><i>Upgrade works to provide a 3,100 p.e. plant at the Collooney WWTP is included in Irish Water’s Investment Plan for 2017-2021. (Note: the figure contained in the Draft Plan is 1,400 p.e.)</i></p> <p>The new updates are minor modifications, which would not represent a material change of the proposed amendment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-9-4 should be <b>ADOPTED</b> as modified by the updated information provided by Irish Water.</p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 10. Environmental quality</b>	
<b>A-10-1</b> In <b>Chapter 10 Environmental quality</b> , Section <b>10.2 Air quality</b> (p. 170 of the Draft Plan), insert an additional subsection containing information on <b>radon gas</b> .	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-2</b> In <b>Section 10.4 Coastal environment</b> , subsection <b>10.4.1 Coastal zone</b> (p.172 of the Draft Plan), modify the definition of the <b>coastal zone</b> and associated areas.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-3</b> In <b>Section 10.4 Coastal environment</b> , subsection <b>10.4.4 Developments on the foreshore and nearshore</b> (p. 173 of the Draft Plan) replace the definition of the <b>foreshore</b> with an extended version.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-4</b> In <b>Box 10.A Proposed coastal protection works</b> (p. 176 of the Draft Plan,) modify the description of proposed works at Pullaheeny.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-5</b> In <b>Section 10.4 Coastal environment</b> , subsection <b>10.4.6 Coastal protection</b> , modify policy <b>P-CP-2</b> (p. 176 of the Draft Plan) as follows:  <b>P-CP-2</b> Require that any development within the coastal zone is appropriately sited <b>and designed</b> having regard to coastal flooding, future shoreline erosion, predicted sea level rise and OPW flood mapping.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-6</b> In <b>Section 10.6 Climate Change</b> , subsection <b>10.6.2 Legislative Context</b> (p.179 -180 of the Draft Plan), modify the text to reflect the current stage of the preparation of the National Mitigation Plan.	<b>SSE (Submission 6)</b> supports this proposed amendment. <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-7</b> In <b>Section 10.6 Climate Change</b> , subsection <b>10.6.3 Role of the Local Authority</b> (p. 180-181), insert the text requiring the repair of old bridges in preference to replacement.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-10-8</b> In <b>Section 10.6 Climate change</b> , subsection <b>Climate adaptation and mitigation policies</b> (p. 182 of the Draft Plan), insert the following additional policy:  <b>P-CAM-11</b> Support the repair of old structures where possible, in particular the repair of the stone arch bridge stock, in preference to replacement with high carbon materials.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-10-9</b> In <b>Section 10.7 Flood risk management</b> (p. 183 of the Draft Plan), insert minor references to aquifers and karst areas.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-10-10</b> In <b>Section 10.7 Flood risk management</b>, subsection <b>10.7.2 Progress in flood risk assessment</b>, (p. 184 of the Draft Plan), update the text to reflect the current stage in the procedure for adopting the Flood risk Management Plans.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 11. Energy and telecommunications</b>	
<p><b>A-11-1</b> In <b>Section 11.1 Energy</b>, subsection <b>11.1.7 Electricity transmission</b> (p. 191 of the Draft CDP), add text reflecting the current stage of preparation of Grid Development Strategy.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-11-2</b> In <b>Section 11.1 Energy</b>, subsection <b>Strategic energy objectives</b> (p. 193 of the Draft CDP), add the following objective:</p> <p><b>SO-EN-2</b> Undertake an analysis of suitable areas for wind energy and prepare a map showing County Sligo's Landscape Suitability for Wind Energy Developments, in accordance with Section 3.5 of the Wind Energy Guidelines (2006).</p>	<p>This proposed amendment is supported by <b>SSE (Submission 6)</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Northern and Western Regional Assembly (Submission 23)</b> endorses the Council's approach, but suggests that the timing of the assessment "may now be opportune, with indications that the publication of new Guidelines on Wind Energy is imminent".</p> <p>The <b>EPA (Submission 3)</b> notes the proposed amendment and recommends that the Plan should ensure consistency with the revised Wind Energy Guidelines, expected to be issued in the near future.</p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED, adding the words "and any subsequent revisions" at the end of the objective.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 13. Development management standards</b>	
<p><b>A-13-1</b> In <b>Section 13.2 General development standards</b>, subsection <b>13.2.14 Undergrounding of cables</b> (p. 218 of the Draft Plan), modify the first paragraph by adding reference to <a href="#">Architectural Conservation Areas</a>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-2</b> In <b>Section 13.2 General development standards</b>, subsection <b>13.2.15 Illumination and spread of light</b> (p. 218-219 of the Draft Plan) inserting additional details on external illumination and <a href="#">floodlighting</a>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-13-3</b> In <b>Section 13.3 Residential development in urban areas</b>, subsection <b>13.3.15 Accommodation for dependent relatives</b>, make minor modifications to the text describing design requirements.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-4</b> In <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b> (p. 230 of the Draft CDP), modify the text by adding a subsection listing “normal planning considerations”.</p>	<p><b>The TII (Submission 7)</b> suggests the inclusion of an additional bullet point in <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b> of the Draft Plan - Normal Planning Considerations, as follows:</p> <p><i>That the proposed development is in accordance with Policy P-NR-1 and the provisions of official policy outlined in the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines in the interests of avoiding direct access to national roads and intensification of existing direct accesses to national roads.</i></p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>It is not necessary to insert a specific reference to the proposed policy P-NR-1 in the <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b> (Development management Standards chapter), or to any other specific policy contained in Chapters 3 to 12. Any development along national roads must comply with the <b>national roads policies set out in the proposed amendment A-8-5</b> and with the requirements of <b>Section 13.8.1 Access onto national roads</b>.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-8-5 should be <b>ADOPTED without further modifications</b>.</p>	
<p><b>A-13-5</b> In <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b>, subsection <b>13.4.2 Site selection – locating a house in the landscape</b> (p. 230 – 231 of the Draft Plan), add clarifications regarding site characteristics for rural houses.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-6</b> In <b>Section 13.4 Residential development in rural areas</b>, delete <b>Table 13.A</b> which details some principles of vernacular rural house design.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>Table 13.A contains important guidance for potential applicants wishing to build a house in the <b>rural vernacular style</b>.</p> <p>The table is NOT a mandatory checklist for applicants or designers of rural houses. New houses can be of modern design or can simply reflect some elements of the traditional styles that are found in County Sligo.</p> <p>Having regard to the Members’ expressed concerns regarding the specific reference in the table to the design of elements such as roof barges, eaves etc., it is considered that the respective items should be removed from Table 13.A.</p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-13-6 should <b>NOT BE ADOPTED</b>.</p> <p><b>Table 13.A should be retained in the final Plan subject to the modifications shown in Appendix 1 of this Report.</b></p>	
<p><b>A-13-7</b> In <b>Section 13.4.3 Rural house design</b>, under the heading <b>Design Statement</b> (p. 233 of the Draft Plan), remove the paragraph recommending the employment of registered architects to build rural houses.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The Planning Authority recommends the use of a registered architect to design houses, since these professionals are trained specifically to produce design solutions that address not just the clients' needs, but also the environmental, landscape and heritage context. <b>This is only a recommendation, NOT a requirement.</b></p> <p>Applicants are entitled to employ whomever they choose to design their house, because there is no legislation requiring the preparation of planning applications by registered architects.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-13-7 should <b>NOT BE ADOPTED</b>.</p>	
<p><b>A-13-8</b> In <b>Section 13.5 Retail development standards</b>, subsection <b>13.5.9 Shop fronts and signage</b> (p. 239 - 240 of the Draft Plan), add the two more standards to the existing list.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-9</b> In <b>Section 13.8 Transportation, roads and parking</b>, subsection <b>13.8.1 Access onto national roads</b> (p. 246 of the Draft Plan), delete the paragraph relating to exceptions from restriction of access onto national roads.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-10</b> In <b>Section 13.8 Transportation, roads and parking</b>, subsection <b>13.8.3 Entrances and sightlines</b> (p. 248 of the Draft Plan), modify the <b>Rural housing</b> subsection by inserting details relating to road safety and the preservation or replacement of roadside boundaries.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-13-11</b> In <b>Section 13.8 Transportation, roads and parking</b>, subsection <b>13.8.5 Car parking requirements, layout and design</b> (p. 249 of the Draft Plan), insert an additional subsection on charging points for <b>electric vehicles</b>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment or text of amended policy/objective	Submissions received (if any)
<b>A-13-12</b> In <b>Section 13.8 Transportation, roads and parking</b> , subsection <b>Car parking standards</b> (p. 249 of the Draft Plan), modify <b>Table 13.B Car parking standards</b> by adding the words “gross floor area” where previously omitted.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>A-A-1</b> At the end of the final Plan, insert a new <b>Appendix H</b> containing the ICOMOS Charter.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-A-2</b> At the end of the final Plan, insert a new <b>Appendix I (capital i)</b> explaining the status of the policies and objectives contained in the SEDP 2010.	The <b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (DHPCLG – Submission 14)</b> support this proposed amendment. <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Corrections</b>	
Minor text corrections are to be made to five chapters and map corrections are to be made to Appendix A.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed corrections should be made.</b>



## Section 3. Recommendations on proposed amendments to Volume 2 of the Draft Plan

The comments and recommendations made on the following pages relate to the **proposed amendments only**. Issues raised in submissions are summarised and addressed only insofar as they relate to proposed amendments. Unrelated issues are not addressed, as they are not relevant to decision-making in this final stage of the Development Plan process.

Where a submission (or more) was received in relation to a proposed amendment, the name of the author is given, along with a brief summary of the comments relating to the proposed amendment. This is followed by the Chief Executive's recommendation.

If no submission was received in relation to a proposed amendment, and there is no concern raised by the Chief Executive, this is indicated in the right-hand column, together with the Chief Executive's recommendation to adopt the proposed amendment.

Whether or not submissions were received in relation to a proposed amendment, where the Chief Executive has concerns, these are stated immediately below the respective proposed amendment, followed by the appropriate recommendation.

<b>Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans</b>	<b>Submissions received (if any)</b>
<b>Chapter 3. Ballinacarrow Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-3-1</b> In <b>Section 3.4 Village-centre mixed-use zone</b> , modify <b>Objective 3.4.E</b> by deleting reference to minimum requirements for open space and density.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 12. Curry Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-12-1</b> Modify the <b>Curry Zoning Map</b> by changing the Mini-Plan Limit to exclude the site shown as <b>A-MP-12-1</b> from the green belt.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 14. Easky Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-14-1</b> Modify the <b>Easky Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-14-1</b> from 'community facilities' to ' <b>residential uses</b> '.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-14-2</b> Modify the <b>Easky Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-14-2</b> from 'green belt' to ' <b>residential uses</b> '.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<b>A-MP-14-3</b> Modify the <b>Easky Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-14-3</b> from 'residential uses' to 'green belt'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 16. Gorteen Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-16-1</b> Modify the <b>Gorteen Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-16-1</b> from 'residential uses' to 'community facilities'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 18. Riverstown Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-18-1</b> Modify the <b>Riverstown Objectives Map</b> by removing the "VC-1" designation from the location along Main Street and placing it on the site shown as <b>A-MP-18-1</b> .	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 19. Tourlestraun Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-19-1</b> In the <b>Tourlestraun Mini-Plan text</b> , insert the previously omitted <b>Buildings of Note</b> section (containing images, information and recommendations on two buildings)	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-19-2</b> Modify the <b>Objectives Map</b> for Tourlestraun by removing the colour designation from two of the four Buildings of Note (shown as <b>A-MP-19-2</b> ).	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 20. Ballincar Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-20-1</b> In <b>Section 20.1 Natural Heritage and open space</b> delete <b>Objective 20.1.B</b> (p. 2 of the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan) which promotes to access to the sea shore.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-20-2</b> Modify the <b>Ballincar Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-20-2</b> from 'green belt' to ' <b>residential uses</b> ' and modify the development limit to include this site.	<b>Richard Hamilton (Future Analytics), on behalf of Joan O'Beirne (Submission 19)</b> , objects to this proposed amendment on the grounds that the proposed zoning will extend the development limit of Ballincar. It is suggested that the Council should zone Ms O'Beirne's lands in the 'heart of the village' for residential purposes, instead of the site subject of this proposed amendment.

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The rationale behind the proposed zoning change from 'green belt' to 'residential' was explained in the Second Chief Executive's Report as follows:</p> <p><i>It is acknowledged that the development pattern of Ballincar is quite linear and dispersed and that additional infill or backland development is required to consolidate the village. Whilst further 'ribbon development' in a northern direction would not be encouraged, it is considered that the proposed zoning is not excessive, as it would accommodate only one additional dwelling.</i></p> <p>At this stage of the Development Plan process, only issues pertaining to the Proposed Amendments can be considered. Therefore, Ms O'Beirne's request to have her land zoned for residential purposes cannot be considered. Furthermore, Ms O'Beirne's land was deemed unsuitable for a residential zoning for a number of reasons (refer to response to Submission no.102 in the Second Chief Executive's Report).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-MP-20-2 should be <b>ADOPTED</b>.</p>	
<p><b>A-MP-20-3</b> Modify the <b>Ballincar Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-20-3</b> from 'green belt' to '<b>commercial uses</b>' and modify the development limit to include this site.</p>	<p><b>Richard Hamilton (Future Analytics), on behalf of Joan O'Beirne (Submission 19)</b>, objects to this proposed amendment on the grounds that the proposed zoning will extend the development limit of Ballincar. It is suggested that the Council should zone Ms O'Beirne's lands in the 'heart of the village' for residential purposes.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The reasoning behind the proposed zoning change from 'green belt' to 'commercial' was explained in the Second Chief Executive's Report as follows:</p> <p><i>The limited space available for the hotel to expand is acknowledged, as is its importance to local enterprise, tourism and employment. The requested extension would be consistent with the northern extremity of the 'open space' zoning to the east and would not therefore further extend the development limit northwards.</i></p> <p>At this stage of the Development Plan process, only issues pertaining to the Proposed Amendments can be considered. Therefore, Ms O'Beirne's request to have her land zoned for residential purposes cannot be considered. Furthermore, Ms O'Beirne's land was deemed unsuitable for a residential zoning for a number of reasons (refer to response to Submission no.102 in the Second Chief Executive's Report).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-MP-20-3 should be <b>ADOPTED</b>.</p>	
<p><b>A-MP-20-4</b> Modify the <b>Ballincar Objectives Map</b> by deleting the entire length of the proposed 'river walks, pedestrian and cycle links' route.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 21. Ballintogher Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-21-1</b> In <b>Section 21.6 Business and enterprise</b> (p. 3 of the Draft Ballintogher Mini-Plan), delete <b>Objective 21.6.B</b> (which refers to the site marked 'ENT-1')	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-21-2</b> Modify the <b>Ballintogher Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-21-2</b> from 'business & enterprise' to 'mixed uses'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-21-3</b> Modify the <b>Ballintogher Objectives Map</b> by deleting the designation 'ENT-1'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 23. Ballysadare Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-23-1</b> In <b>subsection Community facilities</b> (p.1 of the Draft Ballysadare Mini-Plan), delete reference to the existence of a health centre.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-23-2</b> In <b>Section 23.7 Industrial Development</b> , add new <b>objective 23.7.B</b> to facilitate, subject to the detailed assessment of any planning application, the continued use of the existing block-making facility in Harrington's quarry in its current location.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-23-3</b> Modify the <b>Ballysadare Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the sites shown as <b>A-MP-23-3</b> from 'community facilities' to 'open space'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-23-4</b> Modify the <b>Ballysadare Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-23-4</b> from 'open space' to 'mixed uses'.	<b>The EPA (Submission no. 3)</b> notes the recommendations contained in the SEA Addendum and in the Natura Impact Report, and recommends that this proposed amendment <u>not be adopted</u> given the potential impacts on the Ballysadare River and Natura 2000 network.
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>The subject lands are partly brownfield (portable cabins are stored between the river bank and the built-up area) and partly greenfield. The rezoning of the riverside lands from open space to mixed uses has the potential to negatively impact the Ballysadare River (part of Unshin River SAC), Ballysadare Bay SAC/SPA, would conflict with nature conservation policies set out in Section 7.1.1 of CDP (Vol. 1), with inland waters policies set out in Section 7.1.6 of CDP (Vol. 1) and with the flood risk management policies set out in Section 10.7 of CDP (Vol. 1).</p>	

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<p>The SEA Addendum recommends that this proposed amendment is not adopted. In the event that the proposed amendment is adopted, <b>additional mitigation will be required</b> in order to avoid negative impacts on the Ballysadare River SAC and conflict with the CDP policies listed above.</p> <p>The SEA Addendum provides the text for a <u>mitigating objective</u> as follows:</p> <p><b>12.4.I</b> <i>The brownfield and greenfield lands located along the north-eastern banks of Ballysadare River, to the south-east of the bridge, may be used exclusively for the purpose of providing open space for any development in the adjoining mixed-use zone, subject to compliance with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive and with the nature conservation policies, inland waters policies and flood risk management policies set out in Volume 1 of the CDP.</i></p> <p>The <b>Natura Impact Report</b> indicates that the implementation of this proposed amendment is likely to have a significant effect on the Natura 2000 network. Significant negative impacts would be expected to result from the proposed amendment, arising from direct and indirect impacts on habitats (Annex 1) and species (Annex 2) listed in the Habitats Directive, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ habitat loss and fragmentation;</li> <li>▪ decrease in water quantity and quality;</li> <li>▪ changes in local hydrology;</li> <li>▪ increased pollution/erosion;</li> <li>▪ disturbance to habitats or species;</li> <li>▪ direct or indirect damage to the populations for which the Natura 2000 site is designated.</li> </ul> <p>The <b>Conclusion</b> of the <b>Natura Impact Report</b> states that the adoption of the proposed amendment <b>A-MP-23-4</b> would conflict with the provisions of the Habitats Directive, and the adoption of the Draft Plan with this amendment would contravene Section 177.V(c) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), which specifies that planning authorities shall make a land use plan only after having determined that the said plan would not adversely affect the integrity of a European site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment <b>A-MP-23-4</b> should <b>NOT BE ADOPTED</b>.</p> <p>If <b>A-MP-23-4</b> is adopted against the recommendations contained in the Natura impact Report, the SEA Addendum and the EPA, then the following <u>mitigating objective</u> <b>MUST</b> be included in <b>Section 12.4</b> of the <b>Ballysadare Mini-Plan</b>:</p> <p><b>12.4.I</b> <i>The brownfield and greenfield lands located along the north-eastern banks of Ballysadare River, to the south-east of the bridge, may be used exclusively for the purpose of providing open space for any development in the adjoining mixed-use zone, subject to compliance with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive and with the nature conservation policies, inland waters policies and flood risk management policies set out in Volume 1 of the CDP.</i></p>	
<p><b>A-MP-23-5</b> Modify the <b>Ballysadare Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-23-5</b> from 'green belt' to '<b>residential uses</b>'.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-23-6</b> Modify the <b>Ballysadare Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-23-6</b> from 'residential uses' to '<b>open space</b>'.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 24. Carney Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-24-1</b> Modify the <b>Carney Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the sites shown as <b>A-MP-24-1</b> from 'community facilities' to 'residential uses'.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 25. Cliffony Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-24-1</b> Modify the <b>Cliffony Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-25-1</b> from 'green belt' to 'residential uses' and modify the 'development limit' to include the sites.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 26. Collooney Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-26-1</b> Modify <b>subsection Community facilities</b> (p. 1 of the Draft Collooney Mini-Plan) to state that there are three primary schools and three churches.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-26-2</b> In <b>Section 26.8 Wastewater treatment</b> (p. 6 of the Draft Collooney Mini-Plan), delete <b>Objective 26.8.A</b> (relating to lands for expanding the treatment plant)	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-26-3</b> Modify the <b>Collooney Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-26-3</b> from 'public utility' to ' <b>business and enterprise</b> '.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>A-MP-26-4</b> Modify the <b>Collooney Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-26-4</b> from 'commercial uses' to ' <b>sports and playing fields</b> '.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>
<b>Chapter 27. Drumcliff Mini-Plan</b>	
<b>A-MP-27-1</b> In <b>Section 27.2 Built Heritage</b> (p. 2 of the Draft Drumcliff Mini-Plan), add <b>Objective 27.2.C</b> as follows:  <b>27.2.C</b> Prepare and implement a Conservation Plan for the monastic site at Drumcliff in partnership with relevant stakeholders and the local community, subject to the availability of resources.	<b>No submissions received.</b> <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-MP-27-2</b> In <b>Section 27.3 Circulation and Parking</b> (p. 2-3 of the Draft Drumcliff Mini-Plan), modify <b>Objective 27.3.C</b> by inserting references to cycling.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 28. Grange Mini-Plan</b>	
<p><b>A-MP-28-1</b> Modify the <b>Grange Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-28-1</b> from 'green belt' to '<b>tourism-related uses</b>'.</p>	<p><b>Michael Connolly (Submission 21) requests</b> that this zoning be changed to 'mixed use' for the '<i>economic planning and viability of the area</i>'.</p> <p>M. Connolly also suggests removing the 'mixed use' zoning on lands located north-east of centre of Grange (south of the N15), in exchange for the rezoning requested above.</p> <p>In addition, <b>M. Connolly</b> requests that the zoning matrix be amended to permit the following uses in areas zoned for tourism: crèche, nursery, school, garden centre, health, leisure, residential mix up to 3 storeys, commercial mix up to 3 storeys, retirement home, nursing home.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>At this stage of the development plan process, proposed amendments can be adopted, rejected or modified, but only if the modification would be minor.</p> <p>An increase in the area of land zoned for any purpose and an amendment to the Zoning Matrix are NOT minor modifications and cannot be made at this stage. Furthermore, the additional uses suggested in Submission 21 cannot be considered 'tourism-related uses'.</p> <p>It is considered that the zoning of the subject lands for 'tourism-related uses' is appropriate and would not compete with village-centre type uses.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-MP-28-1 should <b>BE ADOPTED without further modifications.</b></p>	
<b>Chapter 29. Mullaghmore Mini-Plan</b>	
<p><b>A-MP-29-1</b> Modify the <b>Buildings of Note</b> section (p. 6 of the Draft Mullaghmore Mini-Plan) by adding the previously omitted description and recommendation for <b>BON-5</b>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-29-2</b> Modify the <b>Mullaghmore Objectives Map</b> by indicating the lands shown as <b>A-MP-29-2</b> subject to the designation "ENT-1".</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<b>Chapter 31. Rathcormac Mini-Plan</b>	
<p><b>A-MP-31-1</b> In <b>subsection Infrastructure</b> (p. 2 of the Draft Rathcormac Mini-Plan), include a statement of the Council's intention to facilitate the provision of a wastewater treatment plant in Rathcormac, if deemed feasible by Irish Water.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 32. Rosses Point Mini-Plan</b>	
<p><b>A-MP-32-1</b> In <b>subsection Village profile</b> (p.1 of the Draft Rosses Point Mini-Plan), include references to the maritime tradition of Rosses Point.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-32-2</b> In <b>Section 32.3.Circulation and parking</b> (p. 3 of Draft Rosses Point Mini-Plan), modify <b>Objective 32.3.D</b> by adding reference to traffic calming measures and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-32-3</b> In <b>Section 32.5 Community facilities</b> (p.4 of Draft Rosses Point Mini-Plan), modify <b>Section 32.5.C</b> by replacing <b>CF-2</b> with <b>CF-1</b>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-32-4</b> Modify the <b>Rosses Point Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-32-4</b> from 'open space' to '<b>green belt</b>'. The development limit should be amended to exclude this site.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 33. Strandhill Mini-Plan</b>	
<p><b>A-MP-33-1</b> In subsection <b>Community facilities</b> (p. 1-2 of Draft Strandhill Mini-Plan), add a reference to Strandhill Golf Club.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-33-2</b> In <b>Section 33.3 Built Heritage</b> (p. 6 of Draft Strandhill Mini-Plan), add <b>Objective 33.3.D</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>33.3.D</b> Prepare a conservation report for Killaspugbrone Medieval Church and Graveyard, in partnership with the community, to inform future conservation works to the Church and graveyard, as resources allow.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b>  <b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>

Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans	Submissions received (if any)
<p><b>A-MP-33-3</b> In <b>Section 33.6 Community facilities</b> (p. 8-9 of Draft Strandhill Mini-Plan), add <b>Objective 33.6.D</b> as follows:</p> <p><b>33.6.D</b> Support the improvement and further development of Strandhill Golf Course subject to compliance with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-33-4</b> In the <b>Buildings of Note</b> section (p. 10-12 of Draft Strandhill Mini-Plan), insert an additional Building of Note – <b>BoN no. 9</b> (including photo, assessment and recommendations) and insert the corresponding indication on the <b>Objectives Map</b>.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-33-5</b> Modify the <b>Strandhill Zoning Map</b> by changing the zoning of the site shown as <b>A-MP-33-5</b> from 'open space' to '<b>residential uses</b>'.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-33-6</b> Modify the <b>Strandhill Objectives Map</b> by adjusting the site marked '<b>OS-1</b>' to reflect the reduced open space zoning at this location.</p>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendment should be ADOPTED.</b></p>
<p><b>A-MP-33-7</b> Modify the <b>Strandhill Objectives Map</b> by adding an indicative pedestrian/cycle link between the upper car park to the seafront and proposed Maritime Centre site.</p>	<p><b>Michael Connolly (Submission 23)</b> objects to this proposed amendment, arguing that the indicative link “may restrict and complicate the proper planning and sustainable development of the overall site”. It is suggested that this link should be removed.</p>
<p><b>Opinion</b></p> <p>Provision is already made for a pedestrian walkway from the upper car park to the seafront in section 33.4 (G.ii) of the Draft Plan (it is also included in the current CDP). The Second Chief Executive's Report acknowledges that the suggested route is not shown along with other indicative pedestrian routes on the Objectives Map. It is therefore considered appropriate to show an indicative route on the Objectives Map.</p> <p><b>Response to Submission 23:</b> This proposed amendment is merely illustrating an existing objective on the Objectives Map. The removal of Section 33.4 (G.ii) from the Draft Plan would constitute a material amendment to the Draft Plan and therefore cannot be considered at this time.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment A-MP-33-7 should be <b>ADOPTED</b>.</p>	

<p><b>Text or description of proposed amendment to the narrative, policies, objectives, Zoning Maps or Objectives Maps in mini-plans</b></p>	<p><b>Submissions received (if any)</b></p>
<p><b>Corrections</b></p>	
<p>The following corrections are to be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- insertion of correct reference numbers of Proposed Protected Structures in eight mini-plans;</li> <li>- insertion of appropriately-scaled maps showing the full extent of proposed walkways, scenic routes and the location of protected views within the green belts in 27 mini-plans;</li> <li>- insertion of a buffer zone around the treatment plant in one mini-plan (Bellaghy).</li> </ul>	<p><b>No submissions received.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed corrections should be made.</b></p>

## Section 4. Recommendations on proposed amendments to the Record of Protected Structures

The Chief Executive's opinion and recommendations made on the following pages relate to the **proposed amendments only**. Issues raised in submissions are summarised and addressed only insofar as they relate to proposed amendments. Unrelated issues are not addressed, as they are not relevant to decision-making in this final stage of the Development Plan process.

Where a submission (or more) was received in relation to a proposed amendment, the name of the author is given, along with a brief summary of the comments relating to the proposed amendment. This is followed by the Chief Executive's recommendation.

If no submission was received in relation to a proposed amendment, and there is no concern raised by the Chief Executive, this is indicated below the proposed amendment, together with the Chief Executive's recommendation to adopt the proposed amendment.

Whether or not submissions were received in relation to a proposed amendment, where the Chief Executive has concerns, these are stated immediately below the respective proposed amendment, followed by the appropriate recommendation.

The submission received the Department of Housing Planning, Community and Local Government (Submission 14) recommends that Sligo County Council considers carefully the merits of all the proposed deletions from the Record of Protected Structures.

The document *Architectural Heritage Protection – Guidelines for Planning Authorities* advises that deletions of structures from the RPS will only take place where the planning authority considers that the protection of a structure, or part of a structure, is no longer warranted. This will generally take place only when the structure has **entirely** lost its special interest value through major accident or where new information has come to light which proves that the special interests value was mistakenly attributed.

With the exception of proposed amendment A-7-RPS, it is considered that the deletion of structures from the existing Record of Protected Structures is not consistent with the Guidelines. The Chief Executive's recommendations reflect this position.

Four other submissions were received, one objecting to the proposed deletion of a structure from the existing RPS and two objecting to the addition of structures to the RPS.

A submission was received from Edward Walsh and Constance Cassidy in reference to Lissadell House. The submission does not refer to a proposed amendment.

## 4.1 Ballymote-Tobercurry Municipal District

### **A-1-RPS**

Omit item no. **53** (Doddy's Shop, Ballymote) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo. The structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) based on its architectural interest.

The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This brightly-painted public house dominates the streetscape with its high roofline and busy facade. The roadside petrol pumps are a rapidly disappearing feature of Irish towns.*

Based on the above NIAH appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-1-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-2-RPS**

Omit item no. **105** (former National School, Carrowcrory, Ballinafad) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo. The decision to include this building on the RPS for the County was based on the recommendation of Heritage Consultancy Services LTD (HCS), commissioned in 2004 by Sligo County Council.

The HCS appraisal of the building reads as follows:

*This is a good example of a mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century National School design and unlike most of the working and former schools in the Sligo area, it still retains many of its original external features such as the timber sashes, slate roof, metal gate.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-2-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-3-RPS**

Omit item no. **112** (single-storey house, Carrowhubbuck South, Enniscrone) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is already on the current RPS for County Sligo. The structure was added to the County Sligo RPS in 2011, on foot of recommendations from Manogue Architects, who were commissioned to examine structures within Local Area Plan areas for possible inclusion on the Record of Protected Structures for the County.

Manogue Architects appraised the building as follows:

*This is a good example of the small vernacular house type, dating from the early 19 Century, which sits well in the rural village setting. The house retains much original and early fabric.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-3-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

#### **A-4-RPS**

Omit item no. **139** (Roslea Cottage, Cloonagleavragh, Easky) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo. It has been given a **Regional rating** in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) based on its architectural interest.

The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This distinctive little house sits comfortably in the landscape and retains many original features including sash windows and wrought-iron gates.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-4-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

#### **A-5-RPS**

Omit item no. **206** (Kesh Church, Fallougher, Kesh) from the final RPS.

**A submission relating to this proposed amendment was received from Martin Timoney (Submission 9), who objects to the deletion of this structure from the RPS.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo. The decision to include this building on the RPS for the County was based on the recommendation of *Heritage Consultancy Services Ltd* who appraised the building as follows:

*This Roman Catholic Church retains some of its original features such as the facade composition, pointed-arched windows openings with Art Nouveau style stained glass windows.*

Based on the above appraisal and on the submission received, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-5-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-6-RPS**

Omit item no. 214 (Church View, Gorteen) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure has been on the Record of Protected Structures since 2005, when it was included on the RPS on foot of a recommendation from the *Heritage Consultancy Services Ltd (HCS)*, commissioned by Sligo County Council. The HCS appraised the building as follows:

*Church View is a modest late 19<sup>th</sup> Century dwelling located just outside the village of Gorteen. It gets its name from its historic view of the Church of Ireland located to the south. The house is of architectural and artistic merit in that it retains its natural slate roof, timber sash windows and cast-iron gateway. Church View is an attractive house situated in a picturesque location, and forms a significant part of the overall character of Gorteen.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-6-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-7-RPS**

Omit item no. 277 (Lisconny House Servants Quarter, Lisconny, Collooney) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-7-RPS should be ADOPTED.**

### **A-8-RPS**

Amend item no. 328 (Thatched cottage, Parke, Enniscrone) to exclude the outbuildings from the final RPS to read as follows:

**Thatched cottage (except rear flat roofed extension and outbuildings) and its two-storey granary**

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo. The decision to include this building on the RPS for the County was based on its inclusion in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH), which gave it a **Regional rating**. The NIAH appraisal of the structure read as follows:

*This handsome thatched house relates well to its adjacent outbuilding. Traditional thatch and corrugated-iron roofing materials harmonise. Original sash windows survive on the north elevation.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that entire complex of structures on the site **merit protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-8-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-9-RPS**

Omit item no. **391** (House, Trotts, Enniscrone) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo and has been given a **Regional rating**. The NIAH description and appraisal of the structure read as follows:

*This interesting farm complex is a good example of vernacular agricultural layout. Slate roofs and unpainted rendered walling form a muted palette. Some original sash windows and wrought-iron gates survive.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-9-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-10-RPS**

Do not include item no. **P-22** (St. Mary's Church, Main Street, Enniscrone) in the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*Although no longer in use and sadly modified, this former church still commands attention. Masonry and roof slating survive as a testament to the skills of the craftsmen who created this fine structure.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-10-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-11-RPS**

Do not include item no. **P-23** (The South Lodge, Enniscrone) in the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH, based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This house is an attractive example of a detached seaside villa of the late-nineteenth century. Although modest in size, it is full of interesting details and the survival of many of the original windows is a particularly attractive feature. Situated at a height with splendid views of the beach, it adds greatly to the character of this seaside town.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-11-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-12-RPS**

Do not include item no. **P-24** (Springmount, Carrowtober, Tobercurry) in the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH, based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This handsome self-contained house retains its original fenestration and much original fabric. The outbuilding to the rear complements the setting. The modestly-detailed gate screen is well-executed and enhances the roadside.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-12-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-13-RPS**

Do not include item no. **P-25** (Glenburne House, Ballymeeny Armstrong, Dromore West) in the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This substantial house is distinctive for its busy arrangement of projecting bays on its front elevation and a fine set of decorative cast-iron railings. An associated complex of outbuildings on the opposite side of the road is also of architectural importance providing an indication of the historical evolution of the site.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure and associated outbuildings **merit protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-13-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-14-RPS**

Do not include item no. **P-26** (House, Ballymeeny Armstrong, Dromore West) in the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

The reasons for the proposed inclusion on the RPS are as follows:

*This building, complete with historic sash windows, original front door, slate roof and decorative chimneys is a fine example of a vernacular dwelling and commercial unit from the mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> Century.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-14-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

**A-15-RPS**

Amend item no. **P-29** (Glebe House, Emlaghfad, Ballymote) as follows:

~~Glebe House~~ Former Church Warden's house

No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.

**Recommendation**

The proposed amendment A-15-RPS should be **ADOPTED**.

**A-16-RPS**

Amend item no. **P-42** (Woodfield Bridge, Woodfield) by replacing the existing photo with the following photograph:



No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.

**Recommendation**

The proposed amendment A-16-RPS should be **ADOPTED**.

## 4.2 Sligo Municipal District

### A-17-RPS

Amend the entry for item no. 137 as follows:

Clogherevagh House and ~~two~~ Gate Lodges

No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.

**Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-17-RPS should be ADOPTED.**

### A-18-RPS

Omit item no. 213 (Thatched cottage, Gorteen, Ballintrillick) from the final RPS.

No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.

**Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for County Sligo and has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH, based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This particularly fine thatched cottage has been very well preserved. Thatch and multiple-pane sash windows are of particular note. A brief glimpse of the interior revealed it too to retain a large amount of original and early fabric. It is a classic example of the vernacular type and represents an important survival preserving a traditional local craft and a building type once much more common in the Irish countryside. Fine wrought-iron gates are also an important survival and add to the overall interest of the site.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-18-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### A-19-RPS

Amend the entry for item no. 283 (Lissadell House and associated features and structures, Lissadell, Carney) by deleting the NIAH registration number ~~32400804~~.

No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.

**Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-19-RPS should be ADOPTED.**

### **A-20-RPS**

Amend the entry for item no. **336** (House, Rathcarrick, Strandhill) as follows:

**House** Two cottages

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-20-RPS should be ADOPTED.**

### **A-21-RPS**

Add a new item, **Holywell Gate Lodge**, to the final RPS (a reference number will be allocated when the amended RPS is finalised):

**Holywell Gate Lodge**, Clogherevagh, Hazelwood, 1860 – 1900, NIAH Reg. No. 32401510



**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is currently included within RPS item **no. 137** (County RPS). The building has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH, based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*The simple charm of this gate lodge lies in its setting at the end of a long driveway and the retention of most of its original form and fabric. Worthy of note are the lattice windows, canopied entrance and brick chimneystack.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-21-RPS should BE ADOPTED.**

## **A-22-RPS**

Add a new item to the final RPS (a reference number will be allocated when the amended RPS is finalised):

**Former saw mill**, Lissadell, Carney, 1870 – 1910, NIAH Reg. No. 32400804



**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

### **Recommendation**

This structure is currently included within RPS item no. 283 (County RPS). The structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH based on its architectural, historical, social and technical interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This ruin of a former saw mill is of clear technical interest particularly in the role it played in serving Lissadell demesne.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-22-RPS should BE ADOPTED.**

## **A-23-RPS**

Add a new item to the final RPS (a reference number will be allocated when the amended RPS is finalised):

**Pilot's watch house**, Rosses Upper, Rosses Point, not included in the NIAH



**A submission was received from the County Sligo Golf Club (Submission no. 10)**, the owner of the building. The Golf Club objects to the proposal to include this structure on the RPS. The submission indicates that the building, which is part of the history and heritage of the Golf Club, is currently used for storage purposes, but the prospect of using the building as a ‘Starter’s Hut’ is being considered. There are concerns that the ‘protected structure’ status might affect its use or future development.

### **Recommendation**

This structure was proposed for inclusion on the RPS by the Rosses Point Development Association. On 27 March 2017, the members of Sligo County Council passed a resolution to include this structure on the RPS for County Sligo.

The structure is not included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH).

The document *Architectural Heritage Protection – Guidelines for Planning Authorities* indicates that a planning authority is obliged to include in the RPS “every structure which, in its opinion, is of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest”.

The Guidelines advise that “care should be taken when compiling the RPS that all reasonable research has taken place and that all structures merit protection”.

The mere identification of potential protected structures is not sufficient. Adequate research and assessment are required in order to determine whether the structure merits protection based on any or all of the above-mentioned criteria (i.e. special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest).

No evidence has been submitted in support of the proposed inclusion of this structure on the RPS, and there are insufficient resources in the Planning Section at present to carry out the necessary research and assessment with regard to this structure.

Due to the above reasons, it is not considered opportune to include this structure on the RPS at the present time. **However, the structure should be assessed and considered for inclusion on the RPS as part of the next review** (A similar recommendation has been made in the Second Chief Executive’s Report in relation to a number of railway structures proposed for inclusion on the RPS.)

**The proposed amendment A-23-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

## **A-24-RPS**

Add a new item to the final RPS (a reference number will be allocated when the amended RPS is finalised):

**Pilot's house**, Rosses Upper, Rosses Point, not included in the NIAH



**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

### **Recommendation**

This structure was proposed for inclusion on the RPS by the Rosses Point Development Association. On 27 March 2017, the members of Sligo County Council passed a resolution to include this structure on the RPS for County Sligo.

The structure is not included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH).

The document *Architectural Heritage Protection – Guidelines for Planning Authorities* indicates that a planning authority is obliged to include in the RPS “every structure which, in its opinion, is of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest”.

The Guidelines advise that “care should be taken when compiling the RPS that all reasonable research has taken place and that all structures merit protection”.

The mere identification of potential protected structures is not sufficient. Adequate research and assessment are required in order to determine whether the structure merits protection based on any or all of the above-mentioned criteria (i.e. special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest).

No evidence has been submitted in support of the proposed inclusion of this structure on the RPS, and there are insufficient resources in the Planning Section at present to carry out the necessary research and assessment with regard to this structure.

Due to the above reasons, it is not considered opportune to include this structure on the RPS at the present time. **However, the structure should be assessed and considered for inclusion on the RPS as part of the next review** (A similar recommendation has been made in the Second Chief Executive’s Report in relation to a number of railway structures proposed for inclusion on the RPS.)

**The proposed amendment A-24-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-25-RPS**

Amend the entry item no. 76 (Fatima House, 47 John Street) as follows:

~~Fatima House~~ House

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-25-RPS should be ADOPTED.**

### **A-26-RPS**

Amend item no. 162 (ACC Bank, 1 Teeling Street) as follows:

(former) ACC Bank (façade only)

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is already on the current RPS for the Sligo and Environs area. The structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the NIAH based on its architectural interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structure reads as follows:

*This distinctive building is much later than, and quite different from, the remainder of the terrace fronting Teeling Street which it terminates. It contains some attractive features such as the oriel window, moulded classical detail and leaded lights to main windows.*

While the interior of the building may no longer contain original features, the designation of a 'façade only' protection without a comprehensive survey of the interior of the building and its curtilage (by a Conservation Architect) would set an undesirable precedent for similar requests.

This may result in valuable heritage features being overlooked and therefore not protected for future generations. This would be contrary to the intent of a Record of Protected Structures.

**The proposed amendment A-26-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-27-RPS**

Omit item no. 229 (Two-storey building with shop-front and carriage arch, Wine Street) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for the Sligo and Environs area. The structure has been given a **Regional rating** in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH), based on its architectural and artistic interest. The NIAH appraisal of the structures as follows:

*This property, located at a change of height in the terrace, is part of a coherent two-storey group which extends to the east. It contains a well-designed, mostly original, shop front with particularly interesting ironwork above the shop front cornice. Original sash windows survive at first floor.*

Based on the above appraisal, it is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-27-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-28-RPS**

Omit item no. 294 (Rathbraghan Farm, Rathbraghan) from the final RPS.

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

#### **Recommendation**

This structure is on the current RPS for the Sligo and Environs area. The farm holding and two buildings appear on the 6-inch OSI maps. They were originally part of the Wynne Estate. The house and outbuildings again appear on the second edition of the OS maps, circa 1910. The house appears to have been in the same ownership since then.

The conservation report submitted with a recent planning application (PL16-190) records the house as being in good condition, with many original features worthy of protection. No information has been submitted to the Planning Authority that would indicate that Rathbraughan House has lost its special interest or that its special interest was mistakenly attributed. It is considered that this structure **merits protection**.

**The proposed amendment A-28-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-29-RPS**

Add a new item to the final RPS:

**Three-storey stone structure**, Lower Quay Street, Sligo, not included in the NIAH



**Frances Kelly (Submission 16)**, one of the owners of this structure, objects to its inclusion on the RPS. It is stated that the building is in poor condition and of no special interest in terms of architectural, historical or cultural significance.

#### **Recommendation**

This structure was proposed for inclusion on the RPS by Tamlyn Mc Hugh. On 27 March 2017, the members of Sligo County Council passed a resolution to include this structure on the RPS for County Sligo.

The structure is not included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH).

The document *Architectural Heritage Protection – Guidelines for Planning Authorities* indicates that a planning authority is obliged to include in the RPS “every structure which, in its opinion, is of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest”.

The Guidelines advise that “care should be taken when compiling the RPS that all reasonable research has taken place and that all structures merit protection”.

The mere identification of potential protected structures is not sufficient. Adequate research and assessment are required in order to determine whether the structure merits protection based on any or all of the above-mentioned criteria (i.e. special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest).

No evidence has been submitted in support of the proposed inclusion of this structure on the RPS, and there are insufficient resources in the Planning Section at present to carry out the necessary research and assessment with regard to this structure.

Due to the above reasons, it is not considered opportune to include this structure on the RPS at the present time. **However, the structure should be assessed and considered for inclusion on the RPS as part of the next review** (A similar recommendation has been made in the Second Chief Executive’s Report in relation to a number of railway structures proposed for inclusion on the RPS.)

**The proposed amendment A-29-RPS should NOT BE ADOPTED.**

### **A-30-RPS**

Amend the description of item no. **P-15** (Railway Bridge over railway, Bleachgreen, Collooney) as follows:

~~This is a rare, possibly unique bridge which supports a disused railway line (the Collooney to Claremorris line) over another former railway line (the Collooney to Enniskillen line).~~

This bridge, constructed in 1895, is the only grade-separated rail-over-rail crossing in Connacht. The bridge accommodates the Sligo-Dublin railway over the track bed of the former link between the closed Waterford, Limerick & Western Railway Line (closed 1975) & the Sligo, Leitrim & Northern Counties Railway Line (closed 1957).

**No submissions were received in relation to this proposed amendment.**

### **Recommendation**

**The proposed amendment A-30-RPS should be ADOPTED.**



# Appendix 1.

## Modified Table 13.A

~~Principles of vernacular rural design~~ A guide to designing a house in the rural vernacular style

<b>Main features of rural vernacular house design</b>	
<b>Proportions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure good roof-to-wall proportions and a high solid-to-void relationship (i.e. greater wall surface than windows and doors).</li> <li>• Composition of windows and doors should be simple and, <i>where suitable</i>, <i>generally</i> symmetrical.</li> <li>• Aim to minimise the distance between the top of the ground-floor windows and the sill of the first-floor windows to achieve good proportions.</li> </ul>
<b>Scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large house needs a large site to ensure effective integration into its surroundings (either immediately or in the future, through planned screening).</li> <li>• Larger houses (e.g. in excess of 200 m<sup>2</sup>) should be sub-divided into smaller elements of traditional form to avoid bulky structures.</li> <li>• Have regard to the scale of surrounding buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Form</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use a simple plan form to give a clean roof shape – a long plan in preference to a deep plan. This will avoid the creation of a bulky shape.</li> <li>• Gable widths should generally not exceed 8 m, (recommended under 6.5 m for narrow plan form)</li> <li>• A traditional storey-and-a-half house with a narrow plan form is preferable to a dormer-style bungalow.</li> <li>• The form of a house affects the appearance of gable elevations. Gable elevations should be simple and <i>roof pitch</i> generally symmetrical.</li> </ul>
<b>Details</b>	
<b>Windows</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size and shape of windows should be <i>consistent uniform</i> on all elevations. Windows should be well proportioned, with a vertical emphasis.</li> <li>• Dormer and bay windows <del>are not vernacular features and</del> should be used sparingly. <del>These features may not be considered appropriate at prominent or scenic locations.</del></li> <li>• Roof lights are preferable to mid-roof dormer windows.</li> </ul>
<b>Roof</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roof pitch should range from 35° to 42°</li> <li>• Natural slate or natural effect slate is preferable</li> </ul>
<b>Chimneys</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chimneys should <i>generally</i> be placed centrally on the ridge and should have vernacular proportions (<del>i.e. they should be c.1.2 m wide</del>).</li> <li>• Chimneys at a gable end should be flush with the gable.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Eaves</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The eaves of a typical vernacular dwelling would <del>should</del> be flush with the wall, soffit omitted and slate would <del>should</del> not project beyond the face of the wall.</li> <li>• Roofs would be constructed without projecting soffit <del>and barge</del> at gable, and without boxed eaves detail.</li> <li>• <del>Eaves lines should be kept simple.</del></li> </ul>
<p><b>Fascia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overhanging roof with a large fascia board adds bulk and clutter to a house.</li> <li>• Decorative fascias or white PVC fascias should be avoided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rainwater gutters/down pipes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In vernacular houses, rainwater gutters would <del>should</del> be affixed to a corbelled eaves course of concrete, brick or stone (as appropriate).</li> <li>• Simple, black, round plastic/cast-iron or aluminium rainwater gutters are recommended.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Doors</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doors should preferably be made of timber, painted and simple in style.</li> <li>• <del>PVC doors visible from the public road will not be permitted.</del></li> <li>• Doors should always reflect the shape of the opening.</li> <li>• A fan light above the door, or a window to the side of the doorway is preferable to large glazed panels on the door.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Porches and conservatories</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Porches and conservatories should be simple in design and in proportion to the building.</li> <li>• The use of mock classical-type porches should be avoided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>External finishes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plastered or rendered walls are suitable finishes for a rural house.</li> <li>• Brick, random rubble stone and pebble dash are not traditional finishes for a rural dwelling and should be avoided.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 2.

### List of persons and organisations that made submissions or observations on the proposed amendments to the RPS and the Draft CDP 2017-2023

Ref. no.	Date received	Name or Agency	On behalf of (where applicable)	Address
1	16/05/17	<b>Elisa Goode</b> Executive Officer, Forward Planning Unit	<b>Department of Education and Skills</b>	Portlaoise Road, Tullamore, Co. Offaly
2	30/05/17	<b>Vincent Roddy</b> National Chairman	<b>Irish Natura &amp; Hill Farmers Association (INHFA)</b>	The Square, Tubbercurry, Co. Sligo
3	14/06/17	<b>Cian O'Mahony</b> Scientific Officer, SEA Section, Office of Evidence and Assessment	<b>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>	EPA Regional Inspectorate, Inniscarra, Co. Cork
4	14/06/17	<b>Michael, Mary and James Jnr. McGoldrick</b>		"The Hideout", Carrowdough, Strandhill, Sligo
5	17/06/17	<b>Roger Garland</b>	<b>Keep Ireland Open</b>	43 Butterfield Drive, Dublin 14
6	19/06/17	<b>Elizabeth Swanwick</b> , Policy Analyst	<b>SSE</b>	Red Oak South, South County Business Park, Leopardstown, Dublin 18
7	19/06/17	<b>Michael McCormack</b>	<b>Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)</b>	Parkgate Business Centre, Parkgate Street, Dublin 8.
8	20/06/17	<b>Martin A. Timoney &amp; Mary B. Timoney</b>		Keash, Ballymote, Co. Sligo
9	20/06/17	<b>Martin A. Timoney &amp; Mary B. Timoney</b>		Keash, Ballymote, Co. Sligo
10	20/06/17	<b>Kevin Fitzsimons</b> Club Secretary	<b>County Sligo Golf Club</b>	Rosses Point, Co. Sligo
11	20/06/17	<b>Michele O'Boyle</b> Solicitor	<b>Walter Burke &amp; Margaret Burke</b> (Caltragh, Sligo)	Courtyard, The Mall, Sligo
12	21/06/17	<b>Edward Walsh &amp; Constance Cassidy</b>		Lissadell House, Ballinfull, Co. Sligo
13	21/06/17	<b>Edward Walsh &amp; Constance Cassidy</b>		Lissadell House, Ballinfull, Co. Sligo

14	21/06/17	<b>Niall Cussen</b> Principal Advisor, Forward Planning Section, Planning & Housing Market Policy and Land Management Division	<b>Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government (DHPCLG)</b>	Custom House, Dublin 1.
15	21/06/17	<b>Eamonn Prenter</b> Director Cunnane Stratton Reynolds, Land Planning & Design	<b>Irish Natural Hill Farmers Association</b>	3 Molesworth Place, Dublin 2
16	21/06/17	<b>Frances Kelly</b>		Sligo Estates, Quay Street, Sligo.
17	21/06/17	<b>Justin O'Brien</b> Acting Executive Officer	<b>Department of Education and Skills</b>	Portlaoise Road, Tullamore, Co. Offaly
18	21/06/17	<b>Suzanne Dempsey</b> Spatial Planning Specialist	<b>Irish Water</b>	Colvill House, Talbot Street, Dublin 1
19	21/06/17	<b>Richard Hamilton</b> Associate Director Future Analytics Consulting Ltd	<b>Joan O'Beirne</b>	23 Fitzwilliam Square (South), Dublin 2
20	21/06/17	<b>Ciara McHugh</b>		Dromore West, Templeboy, Co. Sligo
21	21/06/17	<b>Michael Connolly</b>		Shore Road, Strandhill, Co. Sligo
22	21/06/17	<b>Michael Connolly</b>		Shore Road, Strandhill, Co. Sligo
23	21/06/17	<b>David Minton</b> Director	<b>Northern &amp; Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)</b>	The Square, Ballaghaderreen, Co. Roscommon
24	21/06/17	<b>Michael Connolly</b>		Shore Road, Strandhill, Co. Sligo
25	21/06/17	<b>John and Maura O'Connor</b>		Templeboy, Co. Sligo