

# Appendix 1

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

### Significant Effects on the Environment

As stated in the Introductory Chapter, the Planning and Development Act (2000) requires a Local Area Plan to contain information on the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the Plan. The objective is to assess the impact on the environment of implementing a whole plan, rather than a particular project. Consequently, it must take a more strategic approach than an Environmental Impact Assessment of a particular project.

### Methodology

The methodology devised to carry out the assessment involved scoping, an environmental assessment of the policies of the Local Area Plan, consideration of alternatives and the formulation of mitigation and monitoring measures.

### Scoping

Scoping is a process which helps determine the direction and focus of the assessment. The LAP was assessed for compatibility with relevant plans and guidance documents at national, regional and local level, all of which are described in the introductory chapter. The Plan was found to be consistent with all of these documents.

The Local Authority was consulted in order to determine their opinion on the issues which the assessment should cover.

### Topics

The topics to be discussed are abstracted from the EIS Regulations and include the following:

Human Beings; Flora and Fauna; Soil; Water; Air; Climate; Landscape and Visual Appraisal; Material Assets; Cultural Heritage and finally, Interaction of the Foregoing.

### Assessment

The policies in the Plan are assessed in matrix form against sustainable development criteria (which are derived from the topics) in terms of the significance of their effect on the environment under four categories:

- a) Have no significant effect
- b) Have a beneficial effect or likely beneficial effect
- c) Uncertainty with regard to effect
- d) Deterioration in environmental quality

### Sustainable Development Criteria

The following sustainability criteria were adopted.

### Population

- P1 Promote the creation of a safe, healthy and high quality environment in which to live and work.
- P2 Promote local employment opportunities.
- P3 Promote access to education.
- P4 Promote a balanced community.
- P5 Meet local housing needs

P6 Promote community cohesion.

#### **Bio-diversity / Flora and Fauna**

B1 Safeguard areas of nature conservation importance while increasing potential for wildlife / flora and fauna where appropriate.

#### **Soil**

S1 Protect soil quality.

#### **Water**

W1 Ensure adequate good quality water supply.

W2 Maintain / improve water quality of existing water courses or bodies.

#### **Air / Climate / Noise**

C1 Maintain / promote improvement of air quality.

C2 Promote minimisation of green-house gas emissions to the atmosphere.

C3 Reduce trip generation, trip length and the need for motorised transport.

C4 Promote public transport and attraction of walking / cycling.

C5 Promote sustainable energy use / generation.

C6 Minimise noise pollution.

#### **Cultural Heritage / Material Assets**

H1 Safeguard items or areas of environmental quality.

H2 Create a townscape of high visual quality.

H3 Ensure adequate provision for open space and improved access to open space areas.

(see Matrix)

#### **Alternatives**

The main alternative is the "do-nothing scenario" where an LAP is not prepared. If such an event were to take place, the area would maintain its current physical characteristics. Development is likely to occur in a piecemeal fashion in a less co-ordinated manner. It is unlikely in such a scenario that sustainable objectives relating to less dependence on the motor car, protection of existing amenities of quality and the creation of a high quality visual environment can be achieved.

#### **Overall Findings from the Assessment**

It is clear from the assessment of the policies in the LAP that it has a strong sustainable thrust and focus. Almost all policies were found to be either compatible or not in conflict with sustainability criteria devised for the assessment exercise. No conflicting objectives or policies were evident. Any mitigation measures required arising from the exercise can only be described as minor in nature.

**Section 3.0 Nature and Extent of Development**

Policy No.

NEP 1) New neighbouring developments compatible with adjoining residential development

NEP 2) Provision of a range of employment generating uses including local community and retail facilities

NEP 3) Development of the lands at sustainable densities based on sustainable movement

NEP 4) Facilitate provision of public transport

NEP 5) Provide for residential population of 5600-8000 persons

NEP 6) Provide for employment zone of 100,000-120,000 sq m

**Section 4.0 Land Use**

Policy No.

LUP 1) Allocate land use indicated on Diag 14

LUP 2) Seek the provision of social/affordable housing spread throughout the area to meet Housing

LUP 3) Ensure the creation of a mixed use development at the Neighbourhood Centre to include retail, business, community and residential use

**Section 5.0 Movement**

Policy No.

MP1) Seek the creation of an efficient, functional and safe system for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians

MP2) Encourage the development of an area that is consistent with the mobility and transport objectives in the Dev. Plan

MP3) Encourage a modal split towards public transport, cycling and walking opposed to private motor vehicles

MP4) Provide for a public transport stops in the designated locations

MP5) Require the provision of short term on-street parking in

						Sustainability Criteria												
P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	B1	S1	W1	W2	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	H1	H2	H3
√	√	0	√	√	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√
√	√	√	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	?	?	√	√
√	√	0	√	√	√	?	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	?	?	√	√
√	√	√	√	√	√	x	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0
0	√	0	√	√	0	?	?	0	0	x	x	x	0	x	0	?	?	?
√	√	0	√	0	0	x	?	?	?	x	x	x	√	x	0	0	√	√
√	√	√	√	√	√	?	?	0	0	?	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√	0	0	√	√	√	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
√	√	√	√	√	√	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	√	√
√	0	√	√	0	√	?	?	0	√	√	0	√	√	√	?	?	√	√
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	?	√	0
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	?	√	0
√	0	0	0	0	√	?	?	0	0	?	?	√	√	√	?	?	√	0

selected locations

Policy No.

MP6) Require underground or semi-basement parking for the higher density apartment developments

MP7) Require the provision of cycle lanes in accordance with the network set out at Diagram 5

MP8) Require the provision of good public lighting standard on all routes to create safe and secure conditions.

**Section 6.0 Overall Design**

Policy No.

ODP1) Require a high standard of architectural design in all buildings incl ground finishes, street furniture, landscaping signs

ODP2) Require high standards of design to the building and open space in the employment zone

ODP3) Require recognition of importance of spaces between buildings

ODP4) Ensure that streets and spaces are linked together in a manner to exploit frontages and use landmark elements to provide variety and interest

ODP5) Ensure that node points are articulates in terms of function, activity and three-dimensional expression

ODP6) Require the design of streets and spaces to be self policing by ensuring that they are overlooked and well lit

ODP7) Require designers to articulate clearly public, semi-public and private space

ODP8) Require the development of six distinct residential areas

ODP9) Require building heights to conform with recommendations

for the main streets and spaces shown in Diagram 10

ODP10) Require the use of external materials of good quality

							Sustainability Criteria												
P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	B1	S1	W1	W2	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	H1	H2	H3	
√	0	0	0	0	√	?	?	0	0	√	0	0	0	0	?	?	√	0	
√	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	?	√	√	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	√	√	0	√	√	0	√	√	0	
√	√	0	√	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	0	√	√	
√	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	
√	0	0	√	√	√	?	?	0	x	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	√	√	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	
√	0	0	√	0	√	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	





# Appendix 2

0

## **LIST OF THOSE WHO MADE SUBMISSIONS TO THE STRATEGIC ISSUES PAPER AND A SUMMARY OF THEIR SUBMISSIONS**

### **Mr Noel Burns**

Mr Burns highlighted the presence of the well known as Tobar a Cinn, proposed the blocking of traffic at a point roughly midway along the Old Athlumney Road and stated his belief that the Pond in the area was created as a result of excavation to build the railway embankment.

### **County Meath Vocational Educational Committee (VEC)**

The County Meath VEC requested that provision be made by way of community zoning for sufficient land to enable the building of schools to cater for the population of the area. They envisaged shared Campus provision between Primary and Post Primary Schools. They suggested an area of 18 acres located centrally within the LAP Area to provide for school buildings, playing pitches, community and recreational services.

### **The Department of Education and Science**

The Department recommended that a site of 3-4 acres be reserved for educational purposes in view of the size of the anticipated new population. They also recommended that it be located close to other community facilities including playing fields in order to maximise the sharing of facilities.

### **The Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government**

The Department highlighted the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening and possible application to the LAP area. It also advised on the necessity for appropriate archaeological assessment.

### **The Dublin Transportation Office (DTO)**

The DTO recommended that greater emphasis be placed on bus transport as the sustainable means of servicing the transport requirements of the population of the area. It also recommended that phasing of development be raised as an issue in public consultation. It advocated broadening the discussion in relation to residential density to reduced need to travel and ensuring the viability of public transport. It encouraged consideration of concepts such as 'Streets as Living Spaces' and 'Home Zones'.

### **Patrick and Danny Gallagher**

Frank Burke & Associates made a submission on behalf of Patrick and Danny Gallagher requesting the Council to protect their existing access, provide for a buffer zone between their premises and any new residential development and to allow for the future development of their lands.

### **Navan Education Together National School**

The organisation expressed an interest in locating a permanent School building in the LAP area.

### **North Eastern Health Board**

The NEHB emphasised the importance of health and social care infrastructure within the development of the LAP area.

### **Laurence McLoughlin Limited**

Deaton Lysaght, Architects made a submission on behalf of Laurence McLoughlin Limited. They advocated a considered urban design approach to open spaces and the RT8 Distributor Road. They stressed the importance of the creation of a sense of place having its own clear identity. They advocated their clients' lands which are situated in the southern corner of the LAP area as a suitable location for the neighbourhood centre and employment uses.

### **Mr Michael Smith**

Frank Burke & Associates made a submission on behalf of Mr Smith calling on the Council to protect Mr Smith's right to continue his business while the area is being developed, or alternatively to rezone his lands that lie outside the LAP area. They also requested that services being provided also cater for the future development of lands adjacent to the LAP area.

### **Mr Charles Traynor**

Mr Traynor recommended that there should be a mix of houses and apartments with the housing predominating. He urges a restriction on height to a maximum of two-storeys. He advocated the provision of a nursing home. Employment uses should be restricted in size and kept separate from the residential areas. Work/live units should not be encouraged except in the case of a shop owner living over his/her premises. He highlighted the need for retail and community facilities, a centrally located open space and educational facilities. He regarded the bus service as a better choice of public transport at this stage rather than a development of rail provision.

# Appendix 3

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

