Due to the specific context of Cork City relative to the location of the European sites identified below a combined appropriate assessment screening report is used to assess potential impacts on both sites.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **EUROPEAN SITE DATA**
 |
| **Great Island Channel candidate Special Area Of Conservation (site code 001058)** |
| Conservation objective | To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I habitat(s) and/or the Annex II species for which the SAC has been selected. |
| Qualifying interests | Annex I listed habitats: mudflats, sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, estuaries, spartina swards, Atlantic salt meadows. |
| References and further information  | *Conservation Objectives for Great Island Channel SAC [001058]* (NPWS), *Natura 2000 Standard Data Form* (NPWS), *Site Synopsis Great Island Channel Site Code 001058* (NPWS) (see [www.npws.ie](http://www.npws.ie) for further details) |
|  |
| **Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (site code 004030)** |
| Conservation objective | To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as special conservation interests for this SPA. |
| Qualifying interests | Annex I-listed bird species: bar-tailed godwit, common tern (breeding), golden plover, ruff, whooper swan. Other birds of special conservation interest include black-headed gull, black-tailed godwit, common gull, curlew, dunlin, great crested grebe, grey heron, grey plover, lapwing, lesser black-backed gull, little grebe, oystercatcher, pintail, red-breasted merganser, redshank, shelduck, shoveler, teal, and widgeon. This site is an internationally important wetland site supporting > 20,000 wintering waterfowl. |
| References and further information  | *Conservation Objectives for Cork Harbour SPA [004030]* (NPWS), *Natura 2000 Standard Data Form* (NPWS), *Site Synopsis Cork Harbour SPA Site Code 004030* (NPWS) (see [www.npws.ie](http://www.npws.ie) for further details) |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **DETAILS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**
 |
| **Reference no.** | Wilton Road, Sarsfield Road, Victoria Cross & Western Road Project |
| Development consent type | Local authority own development (Part 8 Planning Development Regulations 2001) |
| Development location | The Sarsfield Road from the N40 onto Wilton Road to Victoria Cross & on to western road as far as Thomas Davis Bridge |
| Distance from cSAC | 11.5km |
| Distance from SPA | 4.87km |
| Description of development | Repaving and in certain cases widening of Roads and footpaths in the area including the widening of Dennehys Cross |
| Relevant strategies or policies | South West Strategic Corridor Study, Witon road to Thomas Davis Bridge & City Development Plan |
| EIS submitted? | no |
| Screening report/NIS submitted? | no |

| 1. **ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY DIRECT, INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**
 |
| --- |
| 1. Is the proposed development directly connected to or necessary for the conservation management of the SPA and/or cSAC? *(If yes, no further assessment required. If no, screening required.)*
 | **No** |
| 1. Is the proposed development located within or partly within the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Is the proposed development located within 100m of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Does the proposed project involve the development, extension or upgrade of a cycleway or walkway within 200m of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Does the proposed development involve development in the intertidal or coastal zone within the potential impact zone of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Could the proposed project increase the level of recreational or other use of marine or intertidal areas within the potential impact zone of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Does the proposed development involve the excavation of previously undeveloped land within an area that has been identified to be at risk of flooding within the potential impact zone of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Does the proposed development involve the removal of significant amounts of topsoil within 100m of the SPA?
 | **No** |
| 1. Does the existing wastewater treatment system have the capacity to treat any additional loading?
 | **n/a** |
| 1. Would the proposed development result in direct surface water or other discharge to water bodies in or feeding into the SPA or cSAC?
 | **\*** |
| 1. Would the proposed development involve dredging or could it result in the mobilisation of marine sediments in the Harbour area?
 | **No** |
| 1. Could the proposed development give rise to increased risk of oil or chemical spillage or leaks within the marine environment or watercourse within the potential impact zone for the SPA or cSAC?
 | **No** |
| 1. Are there relevant plans or projects which, in combination with the proposed development, are likely to give rise to any cumulative effects?
 | **No** |
| **Comments or notes** |
| The proposed surface water drainage system will reuse the existing system including its manholes, outfall etc. No pollutants will enter a river during the construction or use of the street. The Proposed development is not immediately adjacent to any watercourse except for the approach to Thomas Davis Bridge. The proposed works comprise improvements to existing, busy residential thoroughfares which will improve vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian flow. This will in turn improve the receiving environment for any extant development consents including planning permissions. It is considered that any cumulative impact would be neutral or positive.The proposed works renew and enhance an existing urban streetscape which is 11.5km from the cSAC and 4.87km from the SPA. The street uses will not change and it is not envisaged that the works per se will result in additional vehicular or pedestrian traffic, hence the likely impact on the environment will be neutral, and there will be no net impact on the aforementioned European sites. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **SCREENING CONCLUSION STATEMENT**
 |
| ***In view of the above it is considered that*** *(tick one box only)****:*** |
| [ ]  | **Appropriate Assessment is not required**The proposed development is directly connected / necessary to the conservation management of a site. |
| √ | **Appropriate Assessment is not required** It can be excluded through screening that the proposed development will have No significant effects on the sites. |
| [ ]  | **Further information is required** Potential impacts have been identified through initial screening and/or there is insufficient information to enable the planning authority to screen out impacts, but on balance it is determined that the issues could be resolved through minor modifications to the proposed development or by appropriate conditions. The information required is specified below. |
| [ ]  | **Appropriate Assessment is required**Significant issues have been identified and/or significant effects are certain, likely or uncertain, and the submission of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) is required, or the proposed development must be rejected. |
| **Further information required / Comments or Notes** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **Name:** | John Stapleton  |
| **Position:** | A/Senior Engineer, Roads Design & Construction. |
| **Date:** | 9th of May 2016 |