

# **Report on Consultation Submissions regarding the Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme**

**(Scheme Reference: DPE63-9-2018)**

by  
**CAAS Ltd**  
for the  
**Department of Public Expenditure and  
Reform**



**An Roinn Caiteachais  
Phoiblí agus Athchóirithe**  
Department of Public  
Expenditure and Reform



**27 April 2020**

# QA

---

<b>Document Control</b>	<b>Author/Reviewer</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Prepared by</b>	Paul Fingleton & Clare O'Doherty	various dates to 27 April 2020
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Conor Skehan	27 April 2020
<b>Status of this version</b>	Initial DPER comments addressed. Issued as final, pending any further DPER comments.	

---

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Summary of Submissions .....	1
Detailed Review of Submissions .....	3
Copy of Public Consultation Notice .....	12
Report Authors.....	13

## Introduction

CAAS Ltd have been commissioned by the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform to review and report on submissions made during the public consultation carried out in January and February 2020 in relation to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) of the proposed Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme. This consultation was carried out Pursuant to Section 7(1)(c) of the Arterial Drainage Acts 1945 and 1995 as amended, particularly by S.I. 472 of 2019, the European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Arterial Drainage) Regulations 2019.

Consultation was advertised to the public and copies of the scheme documents including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS) were made available in Cork City Hall. The consultation period was from 23 January to 27 February 2020. A copy of the public consultation notice is included at the end of this report.

## Summary of Submissions

A total of nineteen submissions were received; four from statutory bodies and fifteen from members of the public and other bodies.

It should be noted that due to the low number of submissions they cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of the views of the wider public. Nonetheless, they all contain observations which need to be considered to ensure that due account has been taken of all relevant and significant issues.

The nature of the issues raised in the submissions is summarised in the table below. A more detailed review including the names of the respondents and summaries of issues raised is provided in the detailed table which follows.

	Public bodies	Members of the public and other bodies
<b>General nature of submissions</b>		
Positive	0	8
Neutral	1	0
Negative	3	7
<b>Main issues raised in submissions</b>		
Impacts on biodiversity	2	5
Scheme design	1	0
Support for scheme	1	8
Adequacy of assessment	3	3
Adequacy of mitigation measures	2	0
Scheme programme	0	6
Planning	0	1

It can be seen that of the four submissions from statutory bodies, one was neutral and three raised negative issues. Of these three negative submissions, two expressed significant and serious reservations about the scheme and the environmental assessments. These two were from Inland Fisheries Ireland and An Taisce. The third negative submission raised issues of detail concerning the

scheme design and the assessments provided but had expressed no fundamental reservations about the scheme.

An Taisce acknowledge the need to address flooding in the area. However, they consider that the consideration of catchment level alternatives is inadequate. They also question the effectiveness and benefits of what they refer to as the traditional approach to flood management. They express significant reservations about the approach to mitigation of impacts. They regard the proposed mitigation measures as unclear and they set out concerns about the legality of leaving significant details of these measures to be agreed after the consent stage.

Inland Fisheries Ireland support acknowledge the efforts to relieve hardships caused by flooding and a positive fisheries effect of one element of the scheme, the removal of an impassable barrier on the Glenmore Stream. Overall, they have a number of significant concerns in relation to the mitigation of effects on fisheries. These relate to channel maintenance, channel widening and deepening, construction of embankments and flood walls, works at a mill race, generation of suspended solids and timing of works in relation to seasonal fisheries restrictions. The range and nature of issues raised correspond to issues raised in the review of the EIAR and NIS by CAAS Ltd. Inland Fisheries Ireland's approach is generally to suggest further mitigation of adverse effects. This generally indicates that the proposed measures are inadequate.

The other fifteen submissions include twelve from individuals and local business interests one from Cork Nature Network, one from Meadowbrook Estate Group and one from the Green Party.

Eight are in favour of the scheme and the predominant issue raised by these is the timeline for implementation of the scheme and desire to avoid delay and reduce further flooding risk.

One is in relation to flooding issues upstream and is a planning and development matter outside the scope of this scheme and its EIA and AA processes.

Of the other seven, the main issues raised relate to effects on fisheries and other ecological aspects. Three raise issues regarding the adequacy of the assessments carried out.

While inadequacies can in some cases be dealt with through conditions, the reviews of the EIAR and the NIS show why in the case of this scheme, it is recommended to seek further information in relation the EIAR and NIS for this scheme. The recommended further information request has been prepared, *inter alia*, to take account of concerns raised in the submissions and facilitate robust responses to the issues raised.

## Detailed Review of Submissions

Respondent	Topic(s) See totals rows for full topic wordings	Positive / Neutral / Negative [+ / 0 / -]	Brief description	Key scheme document refs	Comments
<b>Relevant Bodies</b>					
<i>An Taisce</i>	Biodiv, Assess, Mit	-	Need for scheme is recognised however need for consideration for catchment level measures is highlighted (below).		
			<p><b>OVERALL DESIGN</b></p> <p>► The traditional approach to flood relief has been widely criticised for its impact on environment and water quality with its effectiveness in flood management also questioned, noted before as having no beneficial impact on major flood events and is likely to increase flooding downstream.</p>	► EIAR s.2.3 'Scheme Design Process' and s.2.5 'Options Assessment'	The assessment of alternatives as presented in the EIAR is considered non-compliant. This is addressed in the recommended request for further information.
			<p><b>VEGETATION</b></p> <p>► It is noted that vegetation removal being done by a suitably qualified ecologist, as stated in the EIAR, is not sufficient and that permission must be sought from appropriate bodies.</p>	<p>► EIAR s.6.8.6, 'Bats' para 'Removal of Trees', bp. Two.</p> <p>► EIAR App 3.2 'Cork County Council - Ongoing River Maintenance Project' para 1</p>	Clarity of mitigation measures (including ecological mitigation measures) are addressed in the recommended request for further information.
			<p><b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b></p> <p>► Concern regarding the drafting of detailed silt control measures and method statements after licensing classifies as a post consent condition and does not constitute full public consultation as required under planning laws. This is also relevant for instream structures of which both are noted to have implications for Natura sites.</p> <p>► It is encouraged to have specific detailed mitigation measures be outlined prior to granting consent with regard to assessing WFD compliance which in turn will also be crucial in assessing Natura 2000 sites (this is discussed in detail within the submission).</p> <p>► It is noted that the mitigation measures are too vague and which the detail will only be established post licensing which goes against both the Habitats Directive and Irish Case Law (outlined in the submissions).</p> <p>► It is requested that licensing not be granted until detailed mitigation measures are proposed.</p>	<p>► EIAR s.6.8.10 'Pollution Prevention Measures'</p> <p>► EIAR s12 Hydrology</p> <p>► CEMP</p>	<p>The deferral of scheme details which have significant potential to affect the level of environmental impacts caused by the scheme until after the granting of an Order would be contrary to the requirements of jurisprudence.</p> <p>Clarity of mitigation measures are addressed in the recommended request for further information.</p>

<i>Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation</i>	Support	0	No observation made.		
			SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME ▶ Dep. Business, Enterprise and Innovation have provided no observations with regard to the scheme.	Noted	Noted
<i>Inland Fisheries Ireland</i>	Biodiv, Assess, Mit	-	Recognised that the scheme is greatly needed and that some aspects provide benefits for fisheries. However, issues and concerns raised are outlined below.		
			FISHERIES ▶ It is noted the scheme will have a negative impact on fisheries both during construction and on a permanent basis, IFI hopes such impacts will be appropriately mitigated. ▶ IFI hopes that OPW supports works to reduce existing obstacles to fish movement.	▶ EIAR s.6.7.2.1 para 'fisheries', s.6.7.2.2 para 'fisheries', s.6.7.2.1 'Short-term construction impacts' para 'Fisheries' and s.6.7.2.2 'Long-term Operational Impacts' para 'Fisheries'.	The scheme and EIAR describe works which will affect fisheries and propose some mitigation measures to address these impacts, including measures intended to improve upstream migration of fish.
			OVERALL DESIGN ▶ A number of advisory points are given with regard to ▶ Channel maintenance; ▶ Culverts/bridges; ▶ Channel widening/deepening; ▶ Embankments; and ▶ The mill race. The submission maintains that further design details are required to enable assessment of impacts of culverts, bridges, channel widening and deepening on fisheries. It also points out a need for mitigation measures to be revised and augmented to ensure that significant impacts on fisheries are appropriately mitigated.	▶ EIAR s.6.8.12 'Channel Maintenance', s.11.3.7 'Channel Maintenance', s.11.5.2 'Operational Mitigation Measures', s.13.3.2.2 'Dive Survey' para 4, s.13.4.1 'Construction Impacts' para 10, s.13.4.2 'Operational Impacts', s.14.5.5 'Operational Impacts', s.14.6.2 'Operational Mitigation Measures' and tbl.17.1 'Assessment of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures'. ▶ EIAR s.4.3.3 'New culverts, culvert replacements and or extensions', s.4.3.7 'Flood relief channel and culvert parallel to Glashaboy River at Hazelwood Avenue',	Gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance, as well in the assessment of its impacts are addressed in the recommended request for further information.

<i>Transport Infrastructure Ireland</i>	Info, Assess	-	Concerns and issues raised are outlined below.		
			<p><b>CONSTRUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ All works must comply with the TII publications DN-STR-03001- Technical Acceptance of Road Structure on Motorways and Other National Roads.</li> <li>▶ The technical Acceptance requirements for the assessment, alteration, modification, strengthening and repair of all road structures (national roads) shall be agreed with the Bridge Management Section of TII.</li> </ul>		These are matters which can be generally be addressed at detailed design stage. Where compliance with any of these standards requires material changes to the scheme as would have potential to change its likely significant environmental effects, these should be addressed in the EIA process. This is addressed in the recommended request for further information.
			<p><b>OVERALL DESIGN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concerns regarding the proposal for increasing hydraulic capacity of existing culvert upstream of Brooklodge Bridge and the construction of flood defence walls adjacent to and abutting Brooklodge Bridge and culvert.</li> <li>▶ Concerns involve the potential for scour of the structure if proposals proceed. TII have requested a scour inspection and assessment report.</li> </ul>		TII state that a scour inspection and assessment report is required in order to 'confirm the likelihood of scour damage arising, and the mitigation measures necessary to prevent scour.' This is addressed in the recommended request for further information.
<b>Statutory body topic totals</b>	<b>Biodiversity (2), Design (1), Support (1), Adequacy of assessment (3), Adequacy of mitigation measures (2), Programme (0), Planning (0)</b>				
<b>+ / 0 / - totals</b>	<b>Positive (0), Neutral (1), Negative (3)</b>				



Members of the Public					
<i>Cashman, Patrick (Grandon Car Sales)</i>	Support	+	Scheme is urgently requested to be accepted due to the reasons outlined below.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Business owner who greatly supports the scheme going ahead. They have suffered greatly from flooding in the past consequently not being able to get insurance</li> <li>▶ Great fear of recurring flooding is highlighted and the impact it will have on the business and private dwelling is outlined.</li> </ul>	▶ EIA s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'	Noted
<i>Cork Nature Network</i>	Biodiv, Assess, Mit	-	Issues and concerns are outlined below.		
			<p>BIODIVERSITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Request to include mitigation measures to encourage wildlife, with at least one riparian zone with native vegetation and cover for otters and wild birds.</li> <li>▶ Noted that an impact on the estuary area could have detrimental impact on waders.</li> <li>▶ Construction in areas is encouraged to be with great care to ensure minimal animal disturbance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.6.8 'Mitigation Measures'</li> <li>▶ EIA s. 6.7.2.2 'Long-term Operational Impacts', para 'Birds' and NIS s.6.2 'Identification of Potential Sources of Impact' para 3., tbl 6-1 para 4, s. 7.2.1 'Cork Harbour SPA', s.7.2.2 'Great Island Channel SAC' and s.7.3.3 'Measures to avoid/mitigate pollution and water quality issues'</li> <li>▶ EIA s.4 'Construction Activities', and s.6.8 'Mitigation Measures'</li> </ul>	These effects are considered to be generally addressed in the EIA however there are significant gaps and deficiencies in this information. Gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance and deficiencies in the assessment of its impacts, are addressed in the recommended request for further information.
<i>Cremin, Rose</i>	Planning	-	Concerns and issues raised are outlined below.		
			<p>OTHER PLANS AND PROGRAMMES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concern regarding the proposal for a development of an EirGrid substation upstream of the scheme. The submitter is urging the Dept. to consider the impact this may have downstream of the scheme and to question the reasoning of EirGrid's chosen site.</li> </ul>	▶ EIA s.6.7.1 'In-combination Effects' para 'Other Developments', and s.16.6 'Cumulative Impacts', s.7.7 'Cumulative Effects', s.8.5.4 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.9.5.4 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.10.5.6 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.11.4.4 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.12.6 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.13.4.3 'Potential Cumulative Impacts', s.14.5.6 'Potential Cumulative Impacts' and s.15.5.4 'Potential Cumulative Impacts'	The consent process for the upstream substation development is subject to applicable planning and development requirements including Flood Risk Assessment requirements arising from the Floods Directive. These requirements properly address potential effects on downstream flood risk.

Foley, Ray	Biodiv., Assess	-	Concerns and issues raised are outlined below.		
			<p>BIODIVERSITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concern regarding the impact of the scheme on the river and its wildlife notably:</li> <li>▶ Otters; and</li> <li>▶ Fish</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIAR s.6/7/9/10/11/12 s.6.7.2 'Impacts of the Proposed Scheme' (during Construction and Operation), s.7.5 'Details of Impacting Elements', s.9.5 'Evaluation of Impacts', s.10.5 'Evaluation of Impacts', s.11.4 'Evaluation of Impacts' and s.12.5 'Evaluation of Impacts'.</li> <li>▶ EIAR s.6 Biodiversity, notably s6.2.4.1 'Otter' (Large Mammal Surveys), s.6.4.1.1 'Field Surveys' (Terrestrial Ecology), s.6.4.3.1 'Otter' (Terrestrial Mammals), tbl. 6.15 'Evaluation of Ecological Impacts', s.6.7.2 'Impacts of the Proposed Development' para 'Otter' (both Construction and Operational) and s.6.8.4 'Otter' (Mitigation Measures)</li> <li>▶ EIAR s6 Biodiversity including s.6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> </ul>	<p>These effects are considered to be generally addressed in the EIAR however there are significant gaps and deficiencies in this information. Gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance and deficiencies in the assessment of its impacts, are addressed in the recommended request for further information.</p>
			<p>OVERALL DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The need for a new approach is encouraged, one where proper care is given to the river with community engagement involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIAR s.2.3 'Scheme Design Process', and s.2.5 'Options Assessment'</li> </ul>	<p>This point is addressed by the request for further information on the consideration of alternatives in the recommended request for further information.</p>
Green, Judith	Support	+	Support of the scheme expressed for the reasons outlined below.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Local resident frustrated at the destruction caused by the Glashaboy flooding to local amenities and homes. Particular concern noted with regard to children's playgrounds and football fields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIAR s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>

<i>Griffin, Josephine</i>	Support, Prog.	+	Urging that the scheme be approved and implemented. Observations, concerns and issues are outlined below.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Local Dentist who has experienced extensive damage and no longer has flood insurance which is causing significant stress on the business given the high cost of dental equipment.</li> <li>▶ Urging that humans are part of the environment also, and that they should be entitled to the protection against flooding.</li> <li>▶ Believes that the scheme if implemented correctly will enhance the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'</li> <li>▶ EIA s.8.3.2.2 'Local Amenity' and s.8.3.3 'Homes' (Receiving Environment), s.8.3.7 Trends in Employment and Economic Activity, s.8.5 'Evaluation of Impacts', notably s.8.5.3 'Operational Impacts'</li> <li>▶ EIA s.8.5.3 'Operational Impacts'</li> </ul>	Noted
			<p>LACK OF PROGRESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Experiencing frustration that the Glashaboy scheme has not yet been implemented as they have worked closely with agencies and contractors throughout and are frustrated at the sight of yet another consultation process.</li> <li>▶ Disappointed at reading in the media that money for the scheme was not sanctioned as it was allocated to other projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.1.2 'Previous EIS Published during 2016 Exhibition Stage' and s.1.6 'Consultation'</li> </ul>	Noted
			<p>FLORA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concern regarding trees in the area, when the river is high they have seen trees floating by their practice.</li> <li>▶ They have contacted Cork County Council informing them of large trees on the river bank at risk of falling over, to which a reply was given that nothing would be done.</li> <li>▶ Concerns regarding the potential for Japanese knotweed in the area to spread further in times of high water level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ NIS s. 4.1 'Natura 2000 Sites' para 6, s.6.2 'Identification of Potential Sources of Impact' para 5, s.7.3.4 'Measures to prevent the spread of non-native invasive species', s.4.7.6 'Invasive Species'</li> </ul>	Gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance and deficiencies in the assessment of its impacts, are addressed in the recommended request for further information.

<i>Kavanagh, William</i>	Biodiv.	-	Objection to the scheme for the reasons outlined below.		
			<p>BIODIVERSITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Objection to the proposed arterial drainage work in the area of O'Callaghans Park to Daly's Field due to its potential impact on seatrout populations;</li> <li>▶ Salmon runs; and</li> <li>▶ Bat populations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> <li>▶ EIA s.6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> <li>▶ EIA s.6 Biodiversity, including s.6.1.2 'Consultation', s.6.2.2 'Bat Surveys', tbl.6.15 'Evaluation of Ecological Receptors', s.6.4.3.3 'Bats' (Receiving Environment), s.6.7.2 (Impacts of the Proposed Scheme' (during Construction and Operational phases), s.6.8.6 'Alternative roosting sites - Bat boxes' para 3.</li> </ul>	<p>These issues which relate to gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance, as well in the assessment of its impacts and in mitigation measures, are addressed in the recommended request for further information.</p>
<i>McCarthy, Roy</i>	Support, Prog.	+	Submission expresses support of the scheme.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Local business owner who greatly supports the scheme being implemented, urging that it be implemented as soon as possible.</li> <li>▶ Owner has been badly impacted in the past due to flooding, significantly impacting business.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.2.2 ' Need for the proposed development'</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<i>Moran, Oliver (Green Party)</i>	Support	+	Submission expressing support of the scheme proceeding.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ It is noted that while the Glashaboy scheme proceeds, other schemes should be re-worked to take into consideration the significant public concern of their impact on the urban amenity and ecology.</li> <li>▶ Acknowledgment made that all works must proceed with appropriate environmental mitigation measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.4 'Construction Activities', and s.6.8 'Mitigation Measures'</li> </ul>	<p>These points are addressed in the recommended request for further information, particularly in the items regarding assessment of ecological and other impacts and adequacy of mitigation measures.</p>

<i>Murray Cantwell, Dean</i>	Biodiv., Assess	-	Objection to the scheme due to the reasons outlined below. Submission includes video indicating seatrout in the area.		
			<p><b>FISHERIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Objection to the scheme due to the impact the scheme may have on Salmon; and</li> <li>▶ Seatrout.</li> <li>▶ Call for more ecological consideration and fisheries involvement in the EIA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> <li>▶ EIA s6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> </ul>	These issues generally relate to gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance, as well to the assessment of its impacts and the proposed mitigation measures. They are addressed in the recommended request for further information.
<i>O'Connell, Dermot</i>	Support, Prog.	+	Support for the scheme outlined however issues and concerns are also outlined below.		
			<p><b>HUMANS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Representative of Glanmire GAA Club disappointed at the lack of mention and attention given to the Club and to the local people given the hardship and damage they have endured due to flooding over the past few years.</li> </ul>	▶ EIA s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'	Noted
			<p><b>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The need for a flood scheme is emphasised given the ever growing population and development of Glanmire. This submission is urging that action be taken immediately.</li> </ul>	▶ EIA s.2.2 ' Need for the proposed development'	Noted
<i>Smith, Chris</i>	Prog.	-	Concerns and issues raised are outlined below.		
			<p><b>LACK OF PROGRESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concerned representative of the local community who is frustrated by the lack of progress on the Glanmire scheme.</li> </ul>	▶ EIA s.1.2 'Previous EIS Published during 2016 Exhibition Stage'	Noted
<i>Stacey, Pat</i>	Support, Prog.	+	Local in support of the scheme.		
			<p><b>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Local of Glanmire community in support of the scheme and urging it to be granted and implemented as soon as possible as the people of Glanmire have been anxiously awaiting a flood defence scheme for several years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.2.2 ' Need for the proposed development'</li> <li>▶ EIA s.1.2 'Previous EIS Published during 2016 Exhibition Stage'</li> </ul>	Noted

<i>Tobin, Maurice</i>	Biodiv.	-	Objections to the scheme for the reasons outlined below, (in 3 submissions).		
			<p>FISHERIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Objection to the scheme due to its potential impact on native Salmon; and</li> <li>▶ Seatrout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> <li>▶ EIA s6 Biodiversity including 6.2.1 Electrofishing Survey, 6.4.2.1 (Aquatic Ecology) Fisheries, Table 6.15 Evaluation of Ecological Receptors, and 6.7.2 Impacts of the Proposed Scheme (during Construction and Operation).</li> </ul>	These issues generally relate to gaps in the description of the scheme, including construction and maintenance, as well to the assessment of its impacts and the proposed mitigation measures. They are addressed in the recommended request for further information.
<i>Walsh, Ann (Meadowbrook Estate group)</i>	Support, Prog.	+	Submission made on behalf of 49 homes in Meadowbrook Estate requesting that the Scheme be approved and implemented as soon as possible.		
			<p>SUPPORT OF THE SCHEME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The submission (lengthily) outlines many of the positive effects the scheme will have on the local environment and Natura sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'</li> <li>▶ NIS s.7.2 'Impact Evaluation'</li> </ul>	Noted
			<p>LACK OF PROGRESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Submission outlines frustration at yet another consultation process and the urgency of implementing the scheme for the local community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ EIA s1.6 'Consultation'</li> <li>▶ EIA s.2.2 'Need for the proposed development'</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Public topic totals</b>	<b>Biodiversity (5), Design (0), Support (8), Adequacy of assessment (3), Mitigation measures (0), Programme (6), Planning (1)</b>				
<b>+ / 0 / - totals</b>	<b>Positive (8), Neutral (0), Negative (7)</b>				

## Copy of Public Consultation Notice

### Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme Public Consultation Notice

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) - Public Consultation Notice under the Arterial Drainage Acts, 1945 and 1995, and Statutory Instrument No. 472 of 2019 European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Arterial Drainage) Regulations 2019 and (Birds and Natural Habitats Regulations 2011 (S.I. No.477 of 2011),  
Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme (Scheme Reference: DPE63-9-2018)

Pursuant to Section 7(1) (c) of the Arterial Drainage Acts 1945 and 1995, the Commissioners of Public Works have submitted the Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme to the Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform, Mr Paschal Donohoe for confirmation. An Environmental Impact Assessment Report has been prepared by ARUP Consulting Engineers on behalf of the Commissioners for Public Works and Cork County Council in respect of the proposed Drainage Scheme. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has also been prepared as part of the AA process to ascertain if the scheme could significantly impact on any site designated for conservation. The NIS also proposes measures to mitigate any adverse impacts of the scheme.

Before the Minister can confirm the scheme, he must first determine if the scheme is likely to have

- A) a significant effect on the environment or
- B) have an impact on the integrity of a Natura 2000 Site (Sites)

Public consultation is now being carried out as part of the confirmation process, and members of the public are invited to make a written submission with respect to

1. the likely effects on the environment of the scheme
2. the scheme's impact on Natura 2000 Site(s)

Submissions can be made in writing at any time during the period of 30 days concluding on Thursday 27 February 2020 by one of the following methods:

By post to: OPW Vote Section, Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, Government Buildings, Upper Merrion St, Dublin 2, D02 R5B3

By e-mail to: [GlashaboySchemeConsultation@per.gov.ie](mailto:GlashaboySchemeConsultation@per.gov.ie)

All submissions should include your name, contact address, contact details (including telephone number and e-mail address) and details of any organisation being represented.

#### Description of Works:

The proposed Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme will include the construction of direct flood defences and conveyance improvement measures along the Glashaboy River and its tributaries. The direct defences proposed include flood walls and embankments with the conveyance improvements consisting of localised channel widening and deepening and the introduction of or replacement of culverts. Future maintenance of the scheme will also be carried out.

Flood defences and conveyance improvements are proposed at a number of locations in the Glanmire/Sallybrook area as follows:

- Sallybrook Industrial Estate
- Hazelwood
- Meadowbrook
- Butlerstown Stream
- Glenmore Stream
- O'Callaghan Park to Glanmire Bridge
- Downstream of Glanmire Bridge (channel maintenance only)

In the townlands of:

- Dunkettle
- Ballynagarbragh
- Corbally North
- Riverstown
- Brooklodge
- Knocknahorgan
- Poulacurry South
- Poulacurry North
- Ballinglanna
- Sarsfieldcourt
- Ballingcrossig

In the County of Cork. Following the boundary alteration under the Local Government Act 2019, the proposed scheme is now within the boundary of Cork City Council.

#### Documentation Inspection Details:

A copy of the scheme and the environmental reports (Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Natura Impact Statement) relating to the Scheme will be available for inspection from Thursday 23rd January until Thursday 27th February 2020 at Reception Desk, The Atrium, Cork City Hall, Anglesea St, Cork between the hours of 9:00am - 4:00pm, Monday to Friday.

Website: All scheme information is available on [www.glashaboyfrs.ie](http://www.glashaboyfrs.ie)

#### Decision on Scheme:

Following the expiry of the consultation period and taking into account submissions made, it is open to the Minister to:

- A) make an order confirming the scheme,
- B) refuse to confirm the scheme, or
- C) refer the scheme back to the Commissioners for revision in specified aspects.

Please note that it is intended to publish, on the Government's website, all submissions received. Submissions received are also subject to the Freedom of Information Acts and may be accessed on foot of third party consultations.



An Roinn Caiteachais  
Phoiblí agus Athchóirithe  
Department of Public  
Expenditure and Reform

## Report Authors

**Paul Fingleton, lead author**, has an MSc in Rural and Regional Resources Planning (with specialization in EIA), University of Aberdeen, 1990. Paul is a member of the International Association for Impact Assessment as well as the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. Paul has over twenty years' experience working in the area of Environmental Assessment. Paul has been involved in a diverse range of projects including contributions to, and co-ordination of, a number of complex EIARs, NISs and / or IPPCL Applications for projects.

Paul is the lead author of the current EPA Guidelines and accompanying Advice Notes on EIARs. He has been involved in all previous editions of these statutory guidelines. He also provides various EIA related consultancy services to the EPA. Paul has engaged by numerous consent authorities to assist at various stages of EIA, Appropriate Assessment (AA) and consultation processes, particularly in reviewing EIARs and AAs. This review work has included reviews of a number of flood relief schemes on behalf of the Department of Public Enterprise and Reform.

**Clare O'Doherty, review assistant**, has a BSc in Environmental Management, Dublin Institute of Technology, 2019. Clare has experience working as part of team projects and in the preparation of EIA documents on behalf of multi-nationals and infrastructural providers. She also liaises with various government agencies and local authorities in order to assimilate the environmental baseline information that is used in SEAs, EIAs and AAs and assists in the preparation of the various SEA, EIA and AA related documentation.