

- No. 95 – Marcus O’Sullivan
- No. 97 – Board of Management of Scoil Sheamais Naofa, Bearna (Local Community/Sports Group)
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran
- No. 99 – Oliver Concannon
- No. 100 – John Concannon
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

Many submissions refer to the issue of land use development in Bearna and as proposed in the LAP. This includes landowners who are looking to maximise the development potential of their lands (all site-specific proposals have already been covered under Issue 1 above) and residents and community groups with concerns regarding the extent and bulk of development allowed for under the LAP.

2.5.2 Sub-Issue 5A – Single Rural Houses/Local Housing Need

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 12 – Catherine Gannon
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 58 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 79 – Bernard, Phil, Brian, Patrick, James, Bridget & Michael O Donnell
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 85 – Eileen & Joseph Hernon

Summary:

The submissions raise concerns regarding the restrictions in the LAP on single rural housing and the definition of local housing need. The main concerns raised are as follows:

- The use of the word "local" in "local housing need" discriminates against certain groups of people and should be replaced by "housing needs".
- A submission notes the resident in Bearna cannot get planning permission for a residence on a site 2 miles away in Furbo and requests that this be addressed in the LAP.
- All local families applying for one-off houses/second family dwellings in VEZ be granted permission on basis of Policy 90 in GCDP 2003-2009 to encourage continuation of local family and community life.
- One-off housing should not be subject to stringent criteria laid out in Policy 87, 88 and 89 in GCDP 2003-2009. One off housing should cater for those who fall into categories laid out in Policy 90 of GCDP 2003-2009 Section (a) to (e) should obtain planning permission (i.e. Section (f) requiring a Language Enurement should not apply).
- Applications for one off houses in Barna area should not be subject to Policy 87, 88 and 89 of current GCDP 2003-2009. Coiste Pobal Bhearna propose changes to Policy 90 of

GCDP 2003-2009. Also propose that Policy VG1 be amended to exclude second family homes from the final clause in the policy. Also propose that Objective LU7 (Green Wedges) and LU8 (Coastal Edge) be amended by replacing local housing need may be permitted with shall.

- Green Wedges restricts housing need-related developments and should be changed to Rural Fringe.
- It is necessary to control inappropriate development but housing needs of families born in the area and who have emigrated and wish to return should be accommodated as in GCDP Policy 86, 87, 88 and 89. These policies should be included in Bearna LAP.
- Statements in LAP that local housing needs may be accommodated should be removed and same policy for housing need available to families wishing to build and live there as GCDP Policy No. 90 (1), (2), (3).
- Concerns regarding proposed 100m setback for development of new homes as this will prohibit family members, who are fluent Irish speakers, from residing in New Village in future. LAP should support native Irish speakers settling in their own community rather than creating barriers, to recognise the linguistic heritage of Bearna.

Response:

The LAP strongly supports developments related to local housing need for local families and others qualifying under the current GCDP 2003-2009. This is clearly stated in numerous sections of the LAP. Nonetheless, in the interests of clarity, it is suggested that the Rural Housing provisions in Section 4.1.5 of the LAP explicitly refer to the housing need provisions in Policy 87, 88, 89 and 90 in the GCDP 2003-2009. This is also necessary to clearly show that the LAP is consistent with the GCDP 2003-2009. The LAP should also refer to other relevant rural housing policies in the GCDP 2003-2009, including those in Section 4.8, 4.9, 4.104.11 and 4.12.

The use of the work 'local' in local housing need refers to the need for applicants to have links to the local area in which they intend to develop and is therefore intrinsic to the concept of housing need in the Bearna area or the County in general. In the interests of clarity, it is suggested that this phrase be replaced with 'genuine rural generated housing need' to match the precise wording used in Policy 90 of the GCDP 2003-2009.

The use of the word local housing need 'may' be accommodated in the Green Wedges and Coastal Edge area is not intended to imply that local housing need developments in these areas will be prevented or given low priority. These areas clearly allow for local housing need developments, as expressed in the wording for the Village Enhancement Zone (these areas will 'accommodate local housing need'), the development potential estimates for these areas (which quantifies the number of local housing need units that could potentially be developed in these areas) and numerous statements throughout the LAP supporting local housing need development in the Plan Area. Not all planning applications based on local housing need grounds will be successful given that normal planning considerations (such as safe access and wastewater disposal) must be applied in all cases and it would therefore be inappropriate to use the word 'shall' be accommodated, as this would imply that developments would be permitted irrespective of other normal planning considerations.

The use of housing need provisions in the Village Enhancement Zone is considered essential to: ensure that the strategic aim of consolidating the village can be promoted and achieved; to prevent further unsustainable ribbon development; to minimise landscape, visual and environmental impacts of urban generated development in the countryside; to promote an efficient use of services, infrastructure, facilities and public transport in the Village Consolidation Zone; to retain the village character and amenity of Bearna; to create a high quality public realm and environment in the village centre; to ensure consistency with the GCDP 2003-2009 given the location of Bearna within the GTPS.

Minutes of Monthly Meeting held on 24th September 2007

The LAP includes numerous provisions to protect the Gaeltacht status and linguistic heritage of Bearna, including in particular Policy 2.6.1B. This based on the provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 and provides a number of objectives to support appropriate developments and other measures that support the Irish language.

Nonetheless, there are clearly certain areas within the plan boundary that are more sensitive to developments and associated impacts than others, such as protected designated sites, the coastal amenity, streams, the open landscape surrounding the village, etc. The LAP therefore seeks to guide local housing development to the most appropriate locations, which is necessary in order to achieve proper planning and sustainable development.

Recommendation:

It is recommended as follows:

- The term 'local housing need' be replaced with 'genuine rural generated housing need' to match the precise wording used in Policy 90 of the GCDP 2003-2009.
- The use of the phrase 'local housing need may also be accommodated subject to the provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 and LAP' be replaced with 'genuine rural generated housing need may also be accommodated subject to the provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 and LAP'.
- An additional bullet point be added under the Rural Housing provisions in Section 4.1.5 of the LAP explicitly referring to the housing need provisions in Policy 87, 88, 89 and 90 in the GCDP 2003-2009.
- An additional bullet point be added under the Rural Housing provisions in Section 4.1.5 of the LAP explicitly referring to the rural housing policies in Section 4.8, 4.9, 4.104.11 and 4.12 of the GCDP 2003-2009.

On the proposal of Cllr Welby and seconded by Comh. Ní Fhatharta it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report with the following changes, to change the word 'may' to 'shall' in the second bullet point above.

2.5.3 Sub-Issue 5B – Village Core Area

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 35 – Mr. Peter O'Fegan
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

From the submissions received, there are a wide range of views regarding the Village Core area proposed in the LAP, including the following:

- Objections to Village Core extending to coast and proposal that area south of R336 be zoned for amenity. If not zoned for amenity then should be preferred location for new primary school.

- Several submissions, including the Pobal Bhearna submission, propose that the Village Enhancement Zone/Coastal Edge be broadened in the Village Core area to provide greater coastal amenity lands.
- A number of submissions refer to the coastal development setback proposed in the Village Core area (this is dealt with under Sub-Issue 7A).
- A submission from 12 residents along Pier Road notes that Pier Road is the centre of the Village Core area and that decisions will directly affect the quality of life of the 10 families currently living there.
- A submission notes that intensive development in Village Core area with 365 units planned are not geared for needs of families and low to medium density should be in this area. Units should be 1.5 storeys in height at most, which is in keeping with size of most houses in area. Area does not have capacity for this kind of development, will make it more of a city than a village. Blasting from basement parking will affect resident's house and all underground streams. Raise questions regarding why units are so small, how can so many units fit into such a small area, what is logic behind this intensive development, who does all this development benefit in long term?
- A number of submissions propose the Village Core area be extended to the north to incorporate parts of the Inner Village area, often up to the new Village Street to allow for a definite boundary and streetscape along the new street.
- A number of submissions support the designation of the landowners' lands as Village Core within the LAP but request that higher densities and building heights be allowed and/or that restrictions arising from community or amenity provisions be removed or reduced.
- Undeveloped areas in Village Core should be allowed to develop at a density consistent with existing new developments in the Village Core area.
- Provision should be made for public buildings in the Village Core (and Inner Village) area, such as a health centre, GCC office, Gardai Station, etc.
- New buildings along R336 should be limited to north side of the road to protect the visual amenity of the main road.
- The Village Core area should be adjusted to take account of the coastal strip proposed to eliminate ambiguity.

Response:

The LAP objective for the Village Core Area is follows:

Objective LU3 – Village Core Area

Promote the development of the Village Core as an intensive, high quality, well-landscaped, appropriately scaled and accessible environment with a mix of residential, commercial, service, tourism and community uses that provides a range of services, facilities and amenities to the local community and visitors to Bearnna.

The lands within the Village Core are possibly the most strategic lands remaining in Bearnna given their centrality within the village, coastal location, access to residential areas and amenities, availability of infrastructure, etc. The LAP therefore proposes a mix of uses to accommodate a range of complementary uses and activities in this strategic area and the creation of a high quality environment that will be enjoyed by the entire community.

There is a need to achieve a balance between the need for development in this area and the provision of adequate amenities to serve the local community and visitors to Bearnna. The LAP includes policies, objectives and guidelines to show how this will be achieved and will benefit a wide range of stakeholders, including local residents, landowners, visitors to Bearnna, environmental considerations, etc.

Minutes of Monthly Meeting held on 24th September 2007

It is not considered appropriate to extend the boundaries of the Village Core area for the following reasons:

- The Village Core area is centred on the core of the village, i.e. the R336 main street and the coastal lands east and west of Pier Road, where development is most mixed, intensive and/or accessible. The extension of the Village Core to the north will dissipate the creation of a high quality mixed use environment in this area that provides the major focal point in the village.
- The Inner Village area allows for a density of 0.45 PAR, which is double that of the recently constructed O'Malley's development to the west in a similar position to the proposed northern expansion of the Village Core area and therefore provides sufficient scope for intensive development on these lands and the creation of a streetscape along the new Village Street.
- The Village Core area allows for a density of over double that of the Inner Village area and an extension of the Village Core designation to cover additional lands will therefore significantly increase the potential number of housing units that can be constructed on these lands. The development areas and density guidelines in the Draft LAP already allows for the construction of almost 1 800 dwelling units, or 5 times the house construction allocation allowed for under the current GCDP 2003-2009.
- The significant increase in development potential will place additional pressure on the already over-burdened public infrastructure, services and facilities in the village.

It is not considered appropriate to reduce the area covered by the Village Core to reflect the coastal amenity strip for the following reasons:

- The development of the coastal amenity park and adjacent development should be integrated to ensure that they are complementary and can be developed in tandem with one another.
- The inclusion of the coastal amenity park within the Village Core area allows for greater flexibility in the design and layout of the park and the manner in which new development will overlook and respond to this new public space. This is necessary to ensure the optimum layout at design/implementation stage and to ensure that opportunities are not lost for designing the park and adjacent development to best suit the needs of the local community and new developments.

The density and design guidelines provided for the Village Core area seek to achieve the requisite balance between an intensive level of development that is human scaled and appropriate to the village centre context with a high level of amenities to serve the local community and new developments in the area. Restricting densities/building heights further or allowing for increased building heights/densities would lead to an imbalance in this relationship and result in either a higher level of development with poor amenity, which would not provide for the needs of the local community, or a high level of amenity with a low level of development, which would likely be resisted by landowners and be difficult if not impossible to implement.

The Village Core area provides for a wide range of different uses and activities and this would include a variety of residential unit sizes. An average unit size has been used for the purposes of estimating the development potential of the lands but the LAP promotes a range of unit sizes and dwelling mix that will cater for a range of family and household types and sizes. The Built Form Assessment undertaken as part of the preparation of the LAP has shown that high quality medium to high density developments can be achieved with only 2 storeys and it is considered that the provisions of the LAP will allow for a significant level of development that is still in character with the village centre context.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Cuaig and seconded by Comh Ó Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the Manager's Report but to include changes already agreed in Sub-Issue 1S and 1T

2.5.4 Sub-Issue 5C – Density and Building Height Guidelines

Submitted By:

- No. 2 – Brian Forde, Patricia Condon, Pat Doyle & Patsy Heffernan
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the density and building height guidelines in the LAP and/or propose alternative densities and/or building height guidelines, including the following:

- A number of site-specific submissions, mainly from landowners or existing businesses in the Village Core, propose increased maximum building heights of 3 storeys, 3.5 storeys or no building height restrictions (i.e. to be decided at design stage) in the Village Core.
- A number of submissions, mainly from residents in the area, propose reduced maximum building heights of 1.5 or 2 storeys in the Village Core area and 1 or 1.5 storeys in the Outer Village and Rural Fringe areas.
- The Pobal Bhearna submission notes that, as results of public consultation process plainly indicate, there is widespread community support for a limit of 2 storeys to be placed on all new buildings. Ideally, building heights should be restricted by absolute height instead of by storey. Suggest that maximum permissible heights should be 9m on north side of R336 and 7m on south side.
- Density of housing proposed in the Village Core area seems unobtainable to achieve 365 houses without exceeding 2 storey height.
- A number of landowners with lands in the Village Core area request that the maximum of 1.25 PAR be applied in this area (the LAP specifies 1.00 to 1.25 PAR).
- The Coiste Pobal Bhearna submission states that density allowed in Green Wedges area is unfairly low compared with other zones and with only 31 units in 80ha.

Response:

The density and building height guidelines have been based on national and local guidelines, a consideration of the existing character and built form of Bearnna, the need to create a high quality public realm and high quality development in the village and the need to provide for the overall aim of consolidating the village and preventing further unsustainable ribbon and urban sprawl.

The density, design and building height guidelines provided for the Village Core area in the LAP seek to achieve the requisite balance between an intensive level of development that is human scaled and appropriate to the village centre context with a high level of amenities to serve the local community and new developments in the area. Restricting densities/building heights further or allowing for increased building heights/densities would lead to an imbalance in this relationship and result in either a higher level of development with poor amenity, which would not provide for the needs of the local community, or a high level of amenity with a low level of development, which would likely be resisted by landowners and be difficult if not impossible to implement.

The building height guidelines in the various areas have been based on the Built Form Assessment undertaken as part of the preparation of the LAP, which has shown that high quality medium to high density developments can be achieved with only 2 storeys and it is considered that the provisions of the LAP will allow for a significant level of development that is still in character with the village centre context.

The LAP provides flexibility in building heights and allows for focal point buildings to have a height of 3 storeys where this is considered necessary, for example for urban design reasons where a focal point such as a village square is located. The LAP also specifies that reduced building heights may be appropriate in certain locations, such as along the coastal lands to reduce impacts on views of Galway Bay and retain the visual amenity and landscape setting of Bearna. The LAP also promotes variety in building heights along the main village streets to counter uniformity and to provide variety and interest in the streetscape and to avoid the creation of 'tunnels' along the main streets.

The building height guidelines for Green Wedge and Rural Fringe areas are based on the precedent set by existing buildings and the need to protect the landscape and visual amenity of these areas. Again, the LAP provides a level of flexibility and each case would need to be considered on its merits and in accordance with the Design Guidelines for Single Rural Houses.

The Village Core area has a maximum density range from 1.00 to 1.25 PAR. This is to the fact there are different types of places and contexts within the Village Core ranging from the R336 main street, where densities would need to be higher to reflect and respond to the main street, to the coastal edge, where densities would need to be lower to provide an appropriate development/foreshore interface, provide public access to the seashore, minimise impacts on views of Galway Bay, etc.

The LAP provides flexibility in the density of development and allows for a higher density where a new focal point is provided. This will help to ensure that a good quality urban design and public realm is generated in Bearna and will provide an incentive for developers to provide public spaces for the community.

The density provided for in the Green Wedge is 0.20 PAR, which is the same as the Rural Fringe area and the Coastal Edge area. This density provides more than adequate scope to develop sites in these areas. It should be noted that the density of the O'Malley's development in the Village Core/Inner Village area is 0.22 PAR and it would therefore be highly inappropriate to permit a greater density of development in the outlying areas surrounding the village.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Comh Ní Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the Manager's Report

2.5.5 Sub-Issue 5E – Green Wedge Area

Submitted By:

- No. 19 – Patrick Duane
- No. 39 – Tom & Claire Cunningham & Family
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bearnna)
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bearnna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh

- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 58 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 68 – Maureen Monaghan
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 92 – Martin & Margaret Concannon
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 99 – Oliver Concannon
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A significant number of submissions have been received in relation to the Green Wedges areas to the east and west of Bearna. The vast majority of the submissions, most of which are from local landowners some of which are also residents in the area, object to the proposed Green Wedges area. The main concerns raised are as follows:

- There are existing green wedges on both sides of Bearna with Barna Woods and Lough Rusheen amenities on the City side and lands along the proposed GCOB, which provide an adequate green wedge buffer to separate Bearna from Galway City and Furbo and an additional area is not necessary.
- The Green Wedge designation will place unfair restrictions on landowning families who wish to build houses and/or second homes for their family members.
- The R336 is already built up and it is therefore not feasible to create a green wedge.
- The village should be allowed to grow towards the east and the west.
- Existing facilities, such as Barna Church, are located within the Green Wedge area and Green Wedge will separate the village from these facilities.
- The LAP gives a low priority to development in the Green Wedge area and wording that local housing need 'may' be accommodated should be replaced by 'shall' be accommodated.
- Some submissions state that the Green Wedge should be removed entirely and replaced with the Rural Fringe area, others state that: the Green Wedge area should be relocated to the north of the above areas to prevent sprawl from Cappagh Road to Aille Road; that a smaller Green Wedge area should be provided; or that parts of the Green Wedge area should be re-designated to Outer Village, Inner Village or Rural Fringe.

The Pobal Bearnna submission requests that the Green Wedges area should be retained in the final adopted version of the LAP.

Response:

The relevant LAP provisions for the Green Wedge area are as follows:

Development Strategy – Objective LU7 (Green Wedges Area)

Retain the areas adjacent to Liberty Stream in the west and Barna Woods in the east as Green Wedges that separate Bearna from Galway City and Na Forbacha, retain the landscape setting and unique village character of Bearna, prevent further ribbon development along the coast and provide opportunities for recreation and amenity. Local housing need may also be accommodated subject to the provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 and the LAP.

Development Framework – Green Wedge Area

Accommodate Local Housing Need, subject to high standards of siting & design, compliance with the requirements of the GCDP 2003-2009, including the appended Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House, & those in this LAP, including the relevant provisions in VD9 & SECTION 4.1.5.

Development Management – Green Wedge Area

Local housing need development in the Village Enhancement Zone should generally be located in the Rural Fringe area wherever possible to avoid impacting on the sensitivities and objectives associated with the Green Wedge and Coastal Edge areas. Applicants will be encouraged to submit landholding maps showing their lands so that opportunities for the optimum location, siting and design of developments can be explored.

The Green Wedge area as proposed in the Draft LAP therefore performs a number of important roles in the Plan Area, including amongst others:

- A strengthened buffer between the village and the city, which will help to retain the separate identity of the village.
- An area for community facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna.
- A landscape, environmental and visual asset that forms an important part of the character and setting of the village.
- A location for local housing need development to support local families and those with links to the local area. The LAP strongly supports developments related to local housing need for local families and others qualifying under the current GCDP 2003-2009. This is clearly stated in numerous sections of the LAP.

The use of the word local housing need ‘may’ be accommodated in the Green Wedges and Coastal Edge area is not intended to imply that local housing need developments in these areas will be prevented or given low priority. These areas clearly allow for local housing need developments, as expressed in the wording for the Village Enhancement Zone (these areas will ‘accommodate local housing need’), the development potential estimates for these areas (which quantifies the number of local housing need units that could potentially be developed in these areas) and numerous statements throughout the LAP supporting local housing need development in the Plan Area. Not all planning applications based on local housing need grounds will be successful given that normal planning considerations (such as safe access and wastewater disposal) must be applied in all cases and it would therefore be inappropriate to use the word ‘shall’ be accommodated, as this would imply that developments would be permitted irrespective of other normal planning considerations.

The use of housing need provisions in the Village Enhancement Zone is considered essential to: ensure that the strategic aim of consolidating the village can be promoted and achieved; to prevent further unsustainable ribbon development; to minimise landscape, visual and environmental impacts of urban generated development in the countryside; to promote an efficient use of services, infrastructure, facilities and public transport in the Village Consolidation Zone; to retain the village character and amenity of Bearna; to create a high quality public realm and environment in the village centre; to ensure consistency with the GCDP 2003-2009 given the location of Bearna within the GTPS.

The majority of submissions request that the Green Wedge area be replaced with Rural Fringe area. There is in fact very little difference between the two areas with regard to accommodating local housing need developments and the density at which these can be developed. The main difference between the two areas is that the LAP encourages these developments to be located in the Rural Fringe area and not the Green Wedge area where applicants have lands available in the Rural Fringe for this use in order to protect the greater environmental and landscape sensitivities associated with the Green Wedge area.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Cuaig and seconded by Comh Ni Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the Manager's Report but to include changes already agreed.

2.5.6 Sub-Issue 5F – Commercial/Industrial Development/Local Economic Development and Tourism

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 95 – Marcus O'Sullivan

Summary:

A number of submissions raise concerns that the LAP does not include sufficient provision for commercial, industrial, local economic development and/or tourism development. The main issues raised include the following:

- Commercial activities are limited to Inner Village area in LAP, which is too restrictive and provision should be made for small local-industries or off-farm enterprises in other areas.
- Agree with a certain amount of commercial development in Bearna but there are many unused units at moment.
- Draft LAP silent on economic development – appropriate local jobs and an employment base. Residential growth needs to be supported by increased commercial, tourism and business uses that provide a range of appropriate employment and investment opportunities (not just retail).
- Propose provision should be made to regularise planning status of existing small industries attached to dwellings (i.e. furniture restoration, upholstery, auto repair, candle making, computer repairs, light engineering, etc.). Propose that provision be made to amend LAP to allow doctors, accountants, solicitors, engineers, etc. to work from home without having to get planning permission.
- Main area of development should be tourism and involves maintaining natural visual amenity of pier, beach and foreshore. Information boards at end of pier should be available to give information on local historical sites and local wildlife.
- There is no fuel filling station in the LAP making a journey inevitable every time fuel is required with negative environmental and ecological impacts.
- There is a major omission relating to commercial/light industrial development in LAP. There is a lack of work opportunities in Bearna for recent growth (more than 100%) in past 4 years and the proposed growth of 1792 housing units. This generates considerable traffic to workplaces in Galway City, even when the GCOB is built. Propose that: lands be set aside for a light industry park close to new GCOB to avoid extra traffic through village core; at least 2 business parks should be added to LAP to serve business and commercial needs in community and allow residents to work locally; existing shopping facilities in Bearna are inadequate and a shopping centre with adequate access and parking should be added to the LAP, located as close as possible to GCOB and including a fuel filling station.

Response:

Section 4.1. 6 of the LAP sets out Guidelines for Commercial, Retail, Office and Tourism Developments. Section 4.1.7 of the LAP sets out Guidelines for Industrial, Enterprise, Wholesale and Warehousing Developments. These sections provide guidance with regard to a wide range of

commercial, industrial, enterprise, economic and tourism developments in the Plan Area. These sections also provide guidance on fuel filling stations.

The majority of the above uses would be encouraged primarily within the Village Core and Inner Village areas, as appropriate, to minimise the impact on existing residential areas and to ensure that developments are well-located with regard to the existing roads, services and infrastructure. The LAP provides a framework for these types of developments but is dependent on private developers putting forward proposals for commercial, tourism, enterprise and other economic developments. These will be assessed in accordance with the objectives in the LAP and GCDP 2003-2009 and based on the merit of the individual application.

The proximity of Bearna to Galway City and the large concentration of employment and supporting residential thresholds in the City will make it difficult to develop a viable economic base in Bearna, at least in the lifetime of the LAP. It is likely that the village will continue to act as a dormitory settlement for the City until such time as residential thresholds increase within Bearna to support a greater range of services, facilities and employment opportunities within the area.

Nonetheless, Bearna does have certain advantages such as a relatively high level of spending power and a high quality coastal location and high level of amenity. The LAP therefore encourages the protection of these assets and the promotion of economic development such as tourism that can capitalise on these assets without adversely impacting on the amenity of Bearna.

It is suggested that an additional paragraph should be added to Section 4.1.7 of the LAP to provide greater clarity regarding small enterprises.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following be added at the end of Section 4.1.7 of the LAP to provide greater clarity regarding small enterprises:

The development of small businesses and enterprises that provide local employment will be encouraged in the Village Core area and the Inner Village area, where appropriate, subject to requirements protecting the amenity of adjacent properties and the provision of adequate access and servicing arrangements. This might include businesses or enterprises traditional to the area, craft based enterprises, tourism based enterprises, etc.

On the proposal of Cllr Welby and seconded by Comh. Ní Fhatharta it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report and it was also agreed to include a statement within the plan promoting, encouraging and consolidating rural enterprise within the plan area. It was also agreed that a statement would be included in the plan promoting the provision of enterprise adjacent to access points along the Galway City Outer Bypass.

2.5.3 Sub-Issue 5G – Coastal Edge Area

Submitted By:

- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh

- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 69 – Murt ó Cualáin
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 79 – Bernard, Phil, Brian, Patrick, James, Bridget & Michael O Donnell
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 83 – Joseph Hernon
- No. 84 – Tadhg O hlarnáin
- No. 85 – Eileen & Joseph Hernon
- No. 88 – Margaret & Tommy Gannon

Summary:

A significant number of submissions have been received in relation to the proposed Coastal Edge area and associated guidelines, in particular the coastal development setbacks proposed. The main issues raised are as follows:

- A number of submissions disagree with the proposed 100m Coastal Development Setback as it is not equitable with the 30m setback in the Village Core, contrary to best practice in other countries, 3m vertical/30m horizontal setback should be sufficient to protect the coastal buffer, would prevent landowner's children from building on their family lands.
- Landowner's lands in Coastal Edge area, which is designated as Primary School Site Option 6, be considered as an appropriate location for a wider range of suitable amenity/alternative developments, such as for a riding school/equestrian use and a suitably designed residential development.
- The Pobal Bhearna submission requests that the Coastal Edge area should be retained in the final adopted version of the LAP.
- A number of submissions propose that the Coastal Edge lands be re-designated as Rural Fringe area.
- A number of submissions propose that the Coastal Edge be a defined width from the HWM, some suggest 30m to 50m, and that the remainder be designated Rural Fringe area.
- Wording in relation to local housing need may be accommodated should be changed to shall be accommodated (this is addressed under Sub-Issue 5A above).
- Several submissions request that landowners' lands in Coastal Edge adjoining the Village Consolidation Zone be re-designated as Outer Village area.
- Wexford CDP 2007-2013 which came into force on 30th April 2007 states as follows: "Objective CZ4 – Prohibits any new building or development including caravans and temporary dwellings within 100m of soft shoreline". GCC should apply same objective in Bearna LAP.

Response:

The relevant objective in the LAP for the Coastal Edge area is as follows:

Objective LU8 – Coastal Edge Area

Protect the Coastal Edge as a high amenity area and utilise the potential of this strategic and sensitive asset to provide a range of recreation, amenity, conservation and visual amenity benefits to the local community, including public access to the coastline, views over Galway Bay, walking and cycling routes and seashore recreation. Local housing need may also be accommodated subject to the provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 and the LAP.

The Coastal Edge area as proposed in the Draft LAP performs a number of important roles in the Plan Area, including amongst others:

- A scenic amenity for Bearna that protects the landscape character and setting of the village and that provides for views over Galway Bay.
- A potential area for community facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna.
- A landscape, environmental and visual asset that forms an important part of the character and setting of the village.
- A location for local housing need development to support local families and those with links to the local area.

It is therefore considered appropriate to retain the Coastal Edge area for the reasons outlined above. It is further considered that the Coastal Edge area provides for local housing need type developments and will therefore continue to provide opportunities for this type of development.

It is not considered appropriate to extend the Outer Village area to cover lands in the Coastal Edge area for the following reasons:

- The Outer Village area provides for a higher density and multiple unit/ housing estate residents developments, which would not be appropriate on undeveloped coastal lands which form part of the landscape setting and character of Bearna and provide views over Galway Bay upon entering or exiting the eastern end of the village.
- The Outer Village area provides for a significantly higher density and level of development than the Coastal Edge and will therefore significantly increase the potential number of housing units that can be constructed on the subject lands. The development areas and density guidelines in the Draft LAP already allows for the construction of almost 1 800 dwelling units, or 5 times the house construction allocation allowed for under the current GCDP 2003-2009.
- The extension of the boundary of the Outer Village area and Village Consolidation Zone to encompass the subject lands will set a precedent for the extension of the boundary in other locations, which will be counter to the overall strategy of consolidating the village and retaining the character and setting of the village, will significantly increase the number of housing units that can be developed, will place additional pressure on the already limited public infrastructure and facilities, etc.

It is not considered appropriate to replace all or part of the Coastal Edge area with Rural Fringe area or to reduce the coastal development setbacks proposed in the LAP for the following reasons:

- The guidelines for the Rural Fringe area are suited to the area north of the village and are not adequate to deal with the sensitive coastal lands, which are major visual, landscape, environmental and amenity asset for Bearna.
- The Coastal Edge area has a unique landscape character and high amenity that require specific guidelines to ensure that development in this area is sustainable and that the character and amenity of these lands and views over Galway Bay can be protected.
- The 100m coastal development setback proposed in the Coastal Edge area reflects the largely undeveloped character of these lands, their peripheral location in relation to the main concentration of development in the village and the need to protect them as a landscape, environmental, visual and amenity asset for the Bearna community. A reduced 30m is considered appropriate in the Village Core given the centrality of these lands and improved levels of access, servicing, developability, etc.
- The use of 100m coastal development setbacks are used in other countries to protect coastal lands and have recently been incorporated in the Wexford County Development Plan 2007-2013 (Policy CZ3).
- There is no Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan in place for County Galway or Ireland which would provide greater guidance on setbacks and other coastal issues and in

the interim the LAP must adopt a precautionary approach on this issue.

- Coastal development setbacks are used in many countries, including Ireland, to ensure that coastal amenity and habitats are protected, that property and human life are protected from harm, that effects of wave action, global warming and sea level rise are taken account of and that costly coastal protection infrastructure is not required to protect developments close to the shore.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ni Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report.

2.5.8 Sub-Issue 5H – Rural Fringe Area

Submitted By:

- No. 34 – Missionaries of the Sacred Heart
- No. 37 – Ms. Emer O'Ceidigh
- No. 38 – Mr. James Parsons
- No. 39 – Tom & Claire Cunningham & Family
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 58 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 76 – Coman Gaughan
- No. 82 – Joseph Concannon & Anthony Concannon
- No. 97 – Board of Management of Scoil Sheamais Naofa, Bearna (Local Community/Sports Group)
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran
- No. 100 – John Concannon
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the Rural Fringe area in the LAP. The main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- A number of submissions, mostly from landowners, propose that the Outer Village area should be extended to include parts of the Rural Fringe area both in relation to lands on the edge of the Outer Village and isolated land parcels some distance from the Outer Village.
- A significant number of submissions, mostly from landowners, propose that the Rural Fringe area be extended to cover parts of the Green Wedge and/or Coastal Edge areas or that lands be rezoned for residential use.
- The Coiste Pobal Bearna submission states that Rural Fringe proposals will curtail rights of existing families in regard to second dwellings. Draconian restrictions in LAP more stringent than Policy 89 of current GCDP 2003-2009. Eco-rural clusters has value as a

method of curtailing ribbon development but right of local individuals and families for one-off second family homes and clusters of second family dwellings should be recognised.

- The Pobal Bhearna submission agrees with the overall zonings/areas provided in the LAP and requests that the Coastal Edge and Green Wedge areas not be altered (by extending the Rural Fringe to cover these areas).
- Rural Fringe area should be open for consideration of low density clustered housing, albeit with an overall village limit in terms of units but no limit housing under need criteria in addition to allocation.

Response:

The LAP objective in relation to the Rural Fringe is as follows:

Objective LU6 – Rural Fringe Area

Retain the lands north of Bearna village as a Rural Fringe that protects the landscape character and setting of the village from inappropriate and ribbon development, that accommodates local housing need and that allows for the future growth and expansion of the village beyond the lifetime of the Plan.

The extension of the Outer Village area to cover parts of the Rural Fringe area or the zoning of parts of the Rural Fringe area for residential development or the allowance of low density housing developments in the Rural Fringe area is not considered appropriate for the following reasons:

- The Outer Village area provides for a higher density and multiple unit/ housing estate residents developments, which would not be appropriate in the Rural Fringe area which is not well-located with regard to the village centre and associated services and facilities.
- A significant proportion of the Rural Fringe lands have limited road frontage and would most likely result in a backland type development pattern if developed at higher densities, which would not be appropriate in the area.
- The extension of the Outer Village area boundary to encompass the Rural Fringe lands would create an inappropriate edge to the Village Consolidation Zone that would not be well integrated with the bulk of the Outer Village area.
- The predominant pattern of development in the Rural Fringe area is single houses on large sites and the higher density and mixed types of development allowed for under the Outer Village or through housing developments would not be consistent with the existing land uses and character of the area.
- The Outer Village area provides for a significantly higher density and level of development than the Rural Fringe and will therefore significantly increase the potential number of housing units that can be constructed on the subject lands. The development areas and density guidelines in the Draft LAP already allows for the construction of almost 1 800 dwelling units, or 5 times the house construction allocation allowed for under the current GCDP 2003-2009.
- The extension of the boundary of the Outer Village area and Village Consolidation Zone to encompass the Rural Fringe lands will set a precedent for the extension of the boundary in other locations, which will be counter to the overall strategy of consolidating the village and retaining the character and setting of the village, will significantly increase the number of housing units that can be developed, will place additional pressure on the already limited public infrastructure and facilities, etc.

It is not considered appropriate to extend the Rural Fringe area to cover all or parts of the Green Wedge Area or Coastal Edge areas for the reasons outlined under Sub-Issue 5E and 5G above.

It is considered that the Rural Fringe provides sufficient scope for local housing need development and given that it:

- Is consistent with the rural housing need policies and objectives in the GCDP 2003-2009.
- Will explicitly refer to the relevant rural housing policies contained in the GCDP 2003-2009 (see Sub-Issue 5A above).
- The development potential estimates in the LAP indicate the potential for 173 new houses to be developed in the Rural Fringe area based on an assumption that only 10% of the remaining land is developed to the densities proposed. This is not intended as a limit and would vary according to the level of development required but it does indicate the substantial potential for further development in the Rural Fringe area. If the full Rural Village area were developed to the densities allowed for under the LAP, there is potential for 1 730 new houses in the Rural Fringe area. This highlights the need for new development to be subject to the housing need requirements in the GCDP 2003-2009 and the LAP to ensure that the village can be consolidated, that ribbon development and urban sprawl can be avoided, that the landscape character and amenity of Bearna can be protected, that efficient use can be made of existing services and infrastructure, that public transport can be promoted, etc.

Recommendation:

No change recommended to the Rural Fringe area.

It is recommended that the local housing need requirements be clarified as recommended under Sub-Issue 5A above.

On the proposal of Comh Ni Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report.

2.5.9 Sub-Issue 5I – Inner Village and Outer Village Areas

Submitted By:

- No. 40 – Michael, Barry & Shane Heskin
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the Inner Village and Outer Village areas proposed in the LAP. The main issues raised are as follows:

- A number of submissions, mostly from landowners, propose that the Outer Village area should be extended to include parts of the Rural Fringe or Green Wedge areas both in relation to lands on the edge of the Outer Village and isolated land parcels some distance from the Outer Village.
- A number of submissions propose that the Inner Village area be extended to cover parts of the Outer Village area or that the Village Core area be extended to cover parts of the Inner Village area. Some of these propose the new Village Street as the boundary for the Village Core to provide a definite boundary and the creation of a streetscape along the new Village Street.
- Some submissions suggest that the Inner Village area be allowed to develop at densities similar to recent new developments in the area.
- A number of submissions support the Outer Village and/or Inner Village designations and associated development guidelines, although in some cases higher density provisions are

requested.

- A few submissions refer to the limited capacity of the Outer Village Area to accommodate new development given the low densities proposed in the area.
- Several submissions propose different growth directions for Bearna, including further to east (rather than the west) and further to the north (rather than to the east and west).

Response:

The LAP objectives for the Inner Village and Outer Village areas are as follows:

Objective LU4 – Inner Village Area

Develop the lands adjoining the new Bearna Village Street as an intensive, high quality, well-landscaped Inner Village area with a mix of residential uses, community facilities, local convenience shop/s, public transport facilities and other complementary uses to serve the residential population of the area.

Objective LU5 – Outer Village Area

Develop the areas surrounding the Village Core and Inner Village area as a less intensive Outer Village area with lower density residential development, community facilities and local services as appropriate with larger plot sizes and landscaped areas.

It is not considered appropriate to extend the Village Core into the Inner Village Area or the Inner Village area into the Outer Village area for the following reasons:

- The extension of the higher intensity areas in the central areas to more outlying areas would not be appropriate to the existing pattern, character and amenity of development in these areas, would be counter to the strategic aim of consolidating development in the village, would allow for the village to sprawl outwards away from the central areas and would not make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services.
- This will significantly increase the potential number of housing units that can be constructed on the subject lands. The development areas and density guidelines in the Draft LAP already allows for the construction of almost 1 800 dwelling units, or 5 times the house construction allocation allowed for under the current GCDP 2003-2009.
- The extension of the boundary of these areas to encompass additional lands will set a precedent for the extension of the boundary in other locations, which will be counter to the overall strategy of consolidating the village and retaining the character and setting of the village, will significantly increase the number of housing units that can be developed, will place additional pressure on the already limited public infrastructure and facilities, etc.
- The density provided for in the Inner Village and Outer Village areas are suited to their respective contexts and allow sufficient scope for a range of densities and development types appropriate to the area. The density provided for in the Outer Village area is almost 1.5 times that of the recent O'Malley's development within the Inner Village area and 1.5 times that of the recent Tigh Phuirseil development in the Village Core area. The density in the Inner Village area is almost twice that of the recent O'Malley's development within the Inner Village area and twice that of the recent Tigh Phuirseil development in the Village Core area.
- The density provided in the Inner Village and Outer Village areas is sufficient to allow for the creation of streetscapes along the New Village Street. This is clearly indicated by the O'Malley's development where a new streetscape has been created at a significantly lower density than that provided for under the Outer Village area.

The extension of the Outer Village area to cover parts of the Rural Fringe area or the zoning of parts of the Rural Fringe area for residential development or the allowance of low density housing developments in the Rural Fringe area is not considered appropriate for the following reasons:

- The Outer Village area provides for a higher density and multiple unit/ housing estate residents developments, which would not be appropriate in the Rural Fringe area which is not well-located with regard to the village centre and associated services and facilities.
- A significant proportion of the Rural Fringe lands have limited road frontage and would most likely result in a backland type development pattern if developed at higher densities, which would not be appropriate in the area.
- The extension of the Outer Village area boundary to encompass the Rural Fringe lands would create an inappropriate edge to the Village Consolidation Zone that would not be well integrated with the bulk of the Outer Village area.
- The predominant pattern of development in the Rural Fringe area is single houses on large sites and the higher density and mixed types of development allowed for under the Outer Village or through housing developments would not be consistent with the existing land uses and character of the area.
- The Outer Village area provides for a significantly higher density and level of development than the Rural Fringe and will therefore significantly increase the potential number of housing units that can be constructed on the subject lands. The development areas and density guidelines in the Draft LAP already allows for the construction of almost 1 800 dwelling units, or 5 times the house construction allocation allowed for under the current GCDP 2003-2009.
- The extension of the boundary of the Outer Village area and Village Consolidation Zone to encompass the Rural Fringe lands will set a precedent for the extension of the boundary in other locations, which will be counter to the overall strategy of consolidating the village and retaining the character and setting of the village, will significantly increase the number of housing units that can be developed, will place additional pressure on the already limited public infrastructure and facilities, etc.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ó' Tuairisg and seconded by Comh Ní Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report and to include changes already agreed

2.5.10 Sub-Issue 5J – Mixed Use Zones, Development Areas, Community Gain and Alternatives to Zoning

Submitted By:

- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

The Pobal Bhearna submission strongly supports the twin concepts of Mixed Use Zoning and Development Areas and favours the Community Gain concept. Combined, these innovative approaches should greatly help to avoid many of the divisive issues that have stifled proper planning and development in Bearna over the years.

The DoEHLG notes that the alternative approach proposed in the LAP will require additional resources and input from the local authority, landowners, developers, etc. and raises concerns whether it will be feasible implement the approach.

Response:

The approach adopted in Bearna is based on a number of factors:

- The high cost of land in Bearna and the difficulty in acquiring sites for the delivery of

much-needed community facilities and amenities for the growing population in Bearna.

- The failure of previous adopted and draft plans based on conventional land use zoning to deliver lands for community use.
- The recognition that high quality environments require a greater range and mix of uses that usually allowed for in single use zones to foster greater interaction, complementarity and accessibility between uses and activities.

It is acknowledged that this may require additional resources and input but it is considered that this is necessary to ensure that Bearna can grow and develop in a manner that is sustainable and that delivers on the needs of the local community.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Kyne it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.5.11 Sub-Issue 5K – Rural Clusters/Home Zones/Residential Clusters

Submitted By:

- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 88 – Margaret & Tommy Gannon
- No. 92 – Martin & Margaret Concannon

Summary:

The above submissions make reference to the concept of eco-clusters or rural clusters as promoted in the LAP in the Village Enhancement Zone. These have been summarised as follows:

- Two of the submissions support the approach and note that eco-rural clusters have value as a method of curtailling ribbon development and so protect and compliment the landscape. One of these submissions also notes that right of local individuals and families for one-off second family homes and clusters of second family dwellings should be recognised.
- Other submissions request that low density residential clusters be allowed in these areas or that residential developments base don the homezone approach be allowed due to limited space for a cluster.

Response:

The LAP promotes the concept of eco-clusters or rural clusters as an alternative to ribbon development. The Development Management Guidelines note as follows:

Multiple residential developments will normally not be permitted in agricultural areas. GCC will, however, consider the development of rural clusters, or 'eco-clusters' in appropriate locations subject to the following requirements:

- *Any planning application made for a Rural Cluster must be made by a legally established development company or co-op that undertakes full responsibility for the realisation of the scheme. This company should be comprised of named individuals who meet the housing need criteria as set out in the GCDP 2003-2009. The company will be required to submit a phasing programme for the proposed scheme and will be responsible for the provision of services, roads, infrastructure and open spaces. Responsibility for maintenance and management of the scheme,*

inclusive of any wastewater treatment plants and landscaping/planting, will also lie with the company.

- *An incremental approach may be considered for emerging clusters where it can be demonstrated that they comply with local housing need requirements, they contribute to the creation of an 'eco-cluster' and that they are adequately assimilated into the landscape.*

This is necessary to ensure that development is for local housing need and that housing estates are not allowed to develop in these areas. More intensive clustered or homezone developments should be located in the Village Consolidation Zone where they can be adequately serviced and are accessibly located with respect to the main services, infrastructure and facilities in the village. To allow otherwise would be counter to sustainable development, the consolidation of the village, the efficient use of services and infrastructure and the protection of the landscape and amenities of Bearna.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.5.12 Sub-Issue 5L – Social and Affordable Housing

Submitted By:

- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

The DoEHLG submission raises concerns that the implications of a move away from conventional land use zoning in LAP needs to be assessed to ensure LAP contributes to the delivery of housing under Part V of PDA 2000-2002.

Response:

Section 96 of the PDA 2000-2002 allows development plans to include provision for social and affordable housing in areas "zoned solely for residential, or for a mixture of residential and other uses". The LAP provides for two broad land use zones – the Village Consolidation Zone and the Village Enhancement Zone. Both of these zones allow for residential use (local housing need-related in the Village Enhancement Zone and general residential development in the Village Consolidation Zone).

It is therefore considered that the zoning provisions of the LAP are in compliance with the requirements of Part V of the PDA 2000-2002 and provide an adequate basis for the provision of social affordable housing. Nonetheless, in the interests of clarity, it is suggested that a paragraph be inserted under Section 4.1.5 of the LAP including guidelines on Part V.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that, in the interests of clarity, a paragraph be inserted under Section 4.1.5 of the LAP including guidelines on Part V as follows (to be inserted before Rural Housing text):

Social and Affordable Housing

The LAP supports the provisions of the County Galway Housing Strategy and the relevant policies and objectives in the GCDP 2003-2009, including those contained within Section 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, with regard to the provision of social and affordable housing as required under Part V of the PDA 2000. An equitable level of social and affordable housing will be provided with up to 20% of land zoned for a mixture of residential and other uses set aside for this purpose. This shall apply primarily to the Village Consolidation Zone but will also be applied in the case of developments of more than 4 houses or for housing on land more than 0.2ha, as per Section 97 (1) (3) of the PDA 2000, in the Village Enhancement Zone. The requirements of Part 5 shall not normally apply in the

case of developments that fall under the category of local housing need, as defined in the GCDP 2003-2009.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhatharta and seconded by Comh Ó' Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6 Issue 6 – Village Design

2.6.1 Issue 6 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 81 – Adriano Cavalleri

Introduction:

A number of submissions, including those listed above, make reference to village or urban design issues. Those relating to building densities and heights have already been dealt with under Sub-Issue 5C above. Additional issues have been dealt with below.

2.6.2 Sub-Issue 6A – Pier Road/Open Space Provision

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)

Summary:

This has been dealt with under Sub-Issue 1E above.

Response:

This has been dealt with under Sub-Issue 1E above.

Recommendation:

This has been dealt with under Sub-Issue 1E above.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6.3 Sub-Issue 6B – Main Village Streets

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

Minutes of Monthly Meeting held on 24th September 2007

The above submissions refer directly to the main village streets, including the RR36 Main Village Street and the New Village Street proposed in the LAP. The main issues raised with respect to these streets in terms of village design include the following:

- An amalgamated drawing should be prepared for Figure 3.1.2, 3.1.3 and 3.2.2 showing proposals for future new streets.
- The Pobal Bhearna submission strongly supports proposals for the Main Village Street and New Village Street. Inclusion of New Village Street now allows GCC to naturally move the Village Core area northwards and this should in turn facilitate keeping the coastal zone at 50m in width. Do not believe that GCC's proposals for an Inner Relief Road are compatible with the planned New Village Street.
- Any further buildings along R336 should follow example of Chemist/Doctor/Dentist building and limited to north side to protect visual amenity of main road.
- New Village Street should provide the boundary to the Village Core area and requires higher intensity designations (Village Core or Inner Village) along its length to create a streetscape along this route.
- In the Main Village Streets, buildings heights from 1 to 3.5 storeys should be considered and a 2m set back from the road edge should be considered to allow for formation of streetscape.
- New Village Street should be reassessed as it is not consistent with what LAP is trying to achieve and appears to be founded on an engineering approach rather than good urban design.

Response:

The LAP promotes a high quality of development and design along the main village street and new village street and includes a range of proposals to ensure that these develop appropriately with suitable streetscapes, village squares, parking provision, pedestrian crossings, traffic management, etc.

The LAP supports the development of the new road as a village street and. Nonetheless, the road will be dealing with high traffic volumes, at least until such time as the new GCOB is constructed, and the design of the new road will need to balance the requirements of village design and road design to ensure the most appropriate solution. This will need to be determined at design stage, although it is proposed to include additional drawings in the LAP to show how the new Village Street might grow and develop with appropriate streetscapes, setbacks, building heights, etc.

The provision of development to the south of the R336 and the creation of an appropriate coastal development setback have been dealt with under Sub-Issue 5B above. The creation of a streetscape along the new Village Street and the building heights allowed for along the village streets have been dealt with under Sub-Issue 5C and 5I above. Sub-Issue 5B and 5I also deal with the proposal to use the new village street as the boundary for the Village Core area.

Sub-Issue 6B is directly related to Sub-Issue 9A dealing with the proposed Inner Relief Road/New Village Street and the road-related issues surrounding this proposal are dealt with under Sub-Issue 9A.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ni Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairis it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6.4 Sub-Issue 6D – Landscaping

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown

Summary:

Draft LAP provides excellent concept of well-designed landscaping as set out in longitudinal sections in Design Strategy section.

Response:

Landscaping is an essential component of the high quality environment that the LAP promotes in Bearna and will require the retention of existing trees and hedgerows and appropriate landscaping in new developments.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Comh Ní Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6.5 Sub-Issue 6E – Light Pollution

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown

Summary:

Public and external lighting on developments in Bearna should be appropriately designed to limit light pollution to maintain views over Galway Bay and to avoid safety hazards.

Response:

Section 4.1.13 provides guidance on External Illumination and states as follows:

If external illumination is proposed, documentation shall be provided that clearly shows that light or glare from such illumination will not adversely affect pedestrian and vehicular traffic or adjacent properties.

This section should be expanded to include public lighting.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the above section be amended to read as follows:

Public Lighting and External Illumination

Public lighting and external illumination should be appropriately designed to limit light pollution and to avoid adverse traffic and amenity impacts, including considerations regarding the protection of residential amenity and visual amenity, such as views and prospects over Galway Bay. If external illumination is proposed, documentation shall be provided that clearly shows that light or glare from such illumination will not adversely affect pedestrian and vehicular traffic or adjacent properties.

On the proposal of Cllr Welby and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6.6 Sub-Issue 6F – Urban Design General

Submitted By:

- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly

Summary:

The above submission raises a wide range of issues regarding the design of the village, including the following:

The Draft LAP includes some references to good design but should go further to include objectives and policies that actively discourage sub-standard urban design and architectural design. The LAP should include references to the following:

- Entrances and thresholds – defines 'first impressions' of a place.
- Character and identity – the way a place looks and feels and the way its buildings and public spaces express themselves.
- Connectivity and linkages – essential for vibrant places, contact among people, etc.
- Public realm – space between buildings, including streets, squares, parks, promenades, open spaces, etc.
- Stewardship and collaboration – coordination of actions, good leadership and integrated decision making.

Response:

The response received from the Conservation Officer notes that issues raised in relation to elements such as "public realm" and "connectivity and linkages" are very relevant. The public realm in particular affects residents and visitors alike and it is recommended that a public realm plan be put in place, which would marry the needs for modern living and accessibility with the character of the village and the historic buildings located within.

The LAP includes numerous policies and objectives relating to village design and the creation of a high quality environment in Bearna, including Section 2.4, which specifically deals with Village Design, and related sections (such as the density guidelines in Section 2.4 and the heritage guidelines in Section 2.6). The LAP explicitly refers to the provision of a high quality public realm (Objective VD3 and VD3), the protection and enhancement of character and identity (Objective VD1 and VD2) and the promotion of connectivity and permeability (Objective VD4).

The LAP does not explicitly refer to the concept of stewardship but it does provide the overall framework to guide public and private investment in accordance with an agreed vision and set of strategies, policies and objectives. The LAP also promotes the collaboration of different landowners, the community and the local authority in delivering projects that will benefit the local community, that are economically viable and that support the creation of a high quality environment in Bearna.

The LAP does not refer explicitly to the creation of thresholds, but Objective VD6 does refer to the need to create focal points and landmarks, including at the entrance to major new developments. Entrances and thresholds are considered to provide an important design consideration in Bearna and it is suggested that an additional objective be inserted under Policy 2.4.2A to cover this.

A design study has recently been undertaken to provide greater guidance on the development of village streets, the intensification of development in the village centre and the creation of a high quality public realm. The main drawings from this study should be inserted into the LAP to provide additional guidance on these issues.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that an additional objective be inserted under Policy 2.4.2A as follows:

Gateways, Entrances and Thresholds

Appropriate gateways, entrances and thresholds should be encouraged at the edges of the village and at the entrance to major new developments. The entrances to the village along the main approach routes should be designed as gateways with high quality public spaces and/or building/structures to create a sense of place, arrival and identity.

Minutes of Monthly Meeting held on 24th September 2007

It is recommended that the main drawings from design study recently undertaken should be inserted into the LAP to provide additional guidance on these issues (see attached report).

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.6.7 Sub-Issue 6H – Public Visual Amenity/Views and Prospects

Submitted By:

- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 81 – Adriano Cavalleri

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues regarding public visual amenity/views and prospects. The main issues raised are as follows:

- There appears to be very limited measures in LAP to protect coastal view from R336. In GCDP 2003-2009 protected view areas were identified and rated. As an absolute minimum, target should be to preserve at least 50% of residual view as unobstructed from R336 right down to sea, including Village Core area.
- Propose that Objective VD14 is already 30 years out of date as bulk of R336 already developed and that design related issues with respect to Village Core area to be decided at design stage of planning applications.
- Any further buildings along R336 should follow example of Chemist/Doctor/Dentist building and limited to north side to protect visual amenity of main road.
- New development should not penalise quality of life of the "old residents" of Bearnna, including village amenities, tidy and pleasant village, beautiful views of Galway Bay (as quality of life and property values dependent on view and this should not be jeopardised by uncaring development) and ongoing access to the village with the existing road.

Response:

The LAP includes policies and objectives to protect the public visual amenity and views and prospects, in particular Objective VD13 provides for the protection of Views and Prospects and VD14 provides for the protection of the Coastal Visual Amenity. These are essential to maintain the character and amenity of Bearnna and to protect views over Galway Bay. The Lap also includes design drawings showing how these objectives might be translated into new developments in the future. It is considered that the Lap provides sufficient guidance on this Sub-Issue whilst still allowing a level of flexibility in determining individual planning applications on their own merits.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Cuaig it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

- No. 45 – Mairéad Walsh
- No. 37 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Lary Walsh
- No. 58 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 64 – David Meehan
- No. 83 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 85 – John O'Donnell
- No. 87 – Pat. Reps of the O'Dwyer Est O/O Kennedy Fitzgerald Solicitors

2.7 Issue 7 – Community Facilities and Amenities

2.7.1 Issue 7 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 2 – Brian Forde, Patricia Condon, Pat Doyle & Patsy Heffernan
- No. 4 – Mr. Raymond Storan
- No. 5 – Michael & Julie Conneely
- No. 6 – Rory O'Donnellan (Barna United FC)
- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 8 – Mrs. Mary Hernon
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 15 – Michael McDonagh (Basketball Club)
- No. 17 – John Folan & Michael Conneely
- No. 19 – Patrick Duane
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna
- No. 22 – Seamus Hickey
- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 25 – Elizabeth Neville
- No. 27 – Anne Flynn (DoES)
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 33 – Betty Ní Hiarnáin (Barna/Furbo Hurling Club)
- No. 36 – Bomac, Crehan & Harris
- No. 39 – Tom & Claire Cunningham & Family
- No. 40 – Michael, Barry & Shane Heskin
- No. 41 – Mr. Joseph Murphy
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 45 – John McMyler
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 50 – Barna GAA Football Club
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 60 – David Meehan
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 65 – John O'Donnell
- No. 67 – Per. Reps of the O'Dwyer Est C/O Kennedy Fitzgerald Solicitors

- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 73 – Grainne O'Donnellan
- No. 75 – Anne O'Donnell
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 79 – Bernard, Phil, Brian, Patrick, James, Bridget & Michael O'Donnell
- No. 83 – Joseph Hernon
- No. 84 – Tadhg O'hlaí
- No. 86 – Betty Kilbane
- No. 92 – Martin & Margaret Concannon
- No. 93 – Barna Handball Club
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 97 – Board of Management of Scoil Sheamais Naofa, Bearna
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

A total of 65 submissions, or over 60% of all submissions, make reference to community facilities and amenities in Bearna. The majority of submissions, including those from local residents, community groups and sporting groups, highlight a lack of facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna and the need for additional facilities and amenities to be provided to serve the growing population in Bearna. There are also a significant number of submissions from local landowners that object to the identification of community facility siting options on their lands and request that these be removed.

2.7.2 Sub-Issue 7A – Coastal Amenity Park, Seaside Promenade and Coastal Development Setback

Part 1 – Increase Setback

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 25 – Elizabeth Neville
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bearnna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuirisig & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bearnna)
- No. 60 – David Meehan
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 65 – John O'Donnell
- No. 75 – Anne O'Donnell
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran

- No. 84 – Tadhg O hIarnáin

Summary:

A significant number of submissions refer to the proposed coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and coastal development setback proposed in the LAP under Objective CF3, CF12 and NH35. The main issues raised are as follows:

- Many submissions from local residents and from Pobal Bhearna propose a greater setback than the 30m (and 15m in some cases) provided for under the LAP from the foreshore boundary wall. The majority view is that a minimum setback of 50m should be provided from the foreshore wall to provide adequate space for a coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and associated facilities and amenities. Some submissions propose a greater setback of 75m or 100m and a number also propose that no further development be allowed south of the R336.
- A number of submissions from landowners and from Coiste Pobal Bhearna propose that the setback be reduced, most commonly to 20m from the HWM. Some submissions state that the coastal amenity park should be established between the HWM and the foreshore boundary. It is argued that a greater setback is unacceptable to coastal landowners, will encourage anti-social behaviour, is greater than required for a coastal park and removes the opportunity to develop a vibrant Village Core based on a total interaction with the coastal edge.

Response:

The LAP objective with regard to the coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and coastal development setback are as follows:

Objective CF3 – Coastal Amenity Park

Support the creation of a linear Coastal Amenity Park along the coastal lands to serve the recreation and amenity needs of the Bearnna community, to provide an appropriate public interface between the village and the coastline and to create a focal point and attractive setting for high quality tourism and mixed use development on the adjoining lands. The park will extend adjacent to the foreshore between Mags Boreen and Lacklea Boreen and will have an adequate width to accommodate a wide range of public amenities and uses.

Objective CF12 – Seaside Promenade

Support the development of a high quality and continuous Seaside Promenade within the Coastal Amenity Park that will be enjoyed by the local community and visitors to the area. The promenade will initially extend from Mag's Boreen to Lacklea Boreen with the potential to ultimately be linked to Silver Strand beach and the City greenway linkages in the east and along the coastline to the west.

NH35 – Village Core

An appropriate coastal development setback will be established in the Village Core area as follows:

- *There shall be a minimum general building setback of 30m from the foreshore field boundary line to allow for the development of the coastal amenity park and a seaside promenade, cycleway, children's playgrounds, landscaped amenity space with picnic tables, seating and improved access routes to the local beaches, Bearnna Pier and water-based activities.*
- *A very limited number of public buildings (such as public toilets or a diving club) and/or those that require a coastal edge location (such as a pub and restaurant) may be inserted at appropriate locations in the amenity park, subject to an absolute minimum setback of 15m from the foreshore wall and low impact design and construction. The loss of parkland*

will be compensated by additional parkland areas extending from the coastal amenity park up towards the R336.

The 30m setback (with a 15m setback in limited cases) from the seawall in the LAP has been based on the following considerations:

- The need to establish a coastal park of sufficient width to accommodate the range of public uses and activities that would need to take place in the area.
- The need to protect the coastal buffer and amenity and associated habitats and natural processes.
- The extensive consultation process undertaken and the widespread support amongst the local community for a coastal amenity park, the majority of whom would be in favour of a minimum 50m setback from the foreshore wall.
- The need to minimise the need for costly infrastructure to protect property, infrastructure and safety along the seashore.
- The need to take into account global warming, sea level rise and increased damage and costs relating to wave action, storm damage and flooding.
- International and local best practice with regard to developments along the foreshore.
- The need to provide a high quality public edge to the coast that will provide an amenity and focal point to enhance new development.

The provision of a 20m setback from the HWM would be counter to all of the above considerations, would provide insufficient space for the range of uses and activities required at the coastal edge, would lead to higher construction and development costs, would result in greater damage to the coastal amenity and buffer and associated habitats and would likely result in greater costs to the local authority to maintain and repair costly coastal protection infrastructure.

The increase of the coastal setback would have merit in terms of providing a greater public asset at the coastal edge, however, the proposal to create a coastal development setback of 50m or more from the foreshore boundary would have result in a substantial land take in the Village Core and would significantly reduce the development potential of the remaining undeveloped lands, would be unacceptable to coastal landowners, would reduce the ability to provide an active edge to the coast using new development and would likely make the coastal amenity park difficult to implement given that the provision of this facility will be largely dependent on the adjacent developments for funding/implementation.

The LAP has sought to achieve an appropriate balance between the need for an appropriate coastal edge, the provision of a coastal amenity park and the facilitation of new developments that will benefit from and interact with this coastal amenity park and seashore. The 30m setback (with 15m in limited cases) proposed in the LAP is considered to be a reasonable balance in achieving the above. It should also be noted that the LAP promotes the preparation of master plans for consolidated blocks of lands and that this would be encouraged in the Village Core to show the detailed design of the coastal amenity park, promenade and adjacent development.

Nonetheless, it would be useful for the LAP to provide greater clarity regarding the type of environment that can be created and it is suggested that more detailed design drawings be included in the LAP showing the proposals.

Recommendation:

No change recommended with regard to Objective CF3, CF12 and NH35. It is recommended that more detailed design drawings be included in the LAP showing the proposals in greater detail to provide additional clarity and guidance.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report

2.7.3 Sub-Issue 7B – Existing/New Primary School

Submitted By:

- No. 5 – Michael & Julie Conneely
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 17 – John Folan & Michael Conneely
- No. 19 – Patrick Duane
- No. 22 – Seamus Hickey
- No. 27 – Anne Flynn (DoES)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 40 – Michael, Barry & Shane Heskin
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 79 – Bernard, Phil, Brian, Patrick, James, Bridget & Michael O'Donnell
- No. 83 – Joseph Herton
- No. 86 – Betty Kilbane
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 97 – Board of Management of Scoil Sheamais Naofa, Bearna
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A substantial number of submissions refer to the provision of a new school site and related proposals in the LAP. The main issues raised are as follows:

- The majority of the submissions highlight problems with the existing school site in terms of its limited capacity to cater for the growing population in Bearna, the constraints associated with the existing site in terms of its limited size for expansion, poor access and traffic and pedestrian safety issues, lack of playing pitches and other support facilities, etc. and the need to relocate the school to a larger site where adequate size, access, support facilities, etc. can be achieved.
- A significant number of these submissions support the central site options identified in the LAP to provide a new school given their accessibility to local residents, the new Village Street, other facilities and amenities in the village, etc.
- The submission from the Board of Management of Scoil Sheamus Naofa wishes

lands in Truskey East (in Rural Fringe area) in ownership of Larry Curran to be included as a potential site for new school with associated facilities for Bearna. The existing school has limited space, traffic problems, etc. and strong connection with Barna Church and was originally to have been built adjacent to Church at Silverstrand. Landowner has agreed in principle to providing 4.5 acres free of charge for school (3.5 acres in landowner's submission) provided his lands (15 acres in size) be included in area zoned residential in new LAP. Landowner has indicated that he would welcome opportunity to progress negotiations.

- The submission from the Department of Education and Science states that the existing primary school has applied to the DoES for an extension and this is being considered. However, given restricted size of existing site, an alternative site for possible future development may be required. DoES would be of opinion that any available land in the area should be zoned for educational purposes.
- A significant number of submissions have been received from landowners objecting to the school site options identified on their lands, including those with lands covered by site option 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7.
- A submission has been received from a landowner supporting site option 6 but requesting that other community facility options be considered on these lands together with appropriate residential development.

Response:

The relevant objective in the LAP in relation to the school site is as follows:

Objective CF 1 – National School

Support the upgrading of Scoil Sheamus Naofa or its relocation to a more appropriate site with increased pupil capacity, more expansive recreational facilities and improved and safer access. A number of potential siting options have been identified and an optimum site has been identified along the new village street. These sites and the surrounding lands should not be developed until such time as a suitable school site has been secured, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. In the interim, these sites should be reserved as amenity areas and could be considered for the development of parks and other appropriate public uses.

A total of 7 potential siting options have been considered for the primary school, each with a site size of approximately 7 acres, including 3 central sites along the proposed new Village Street (Option 1, 2 and 3), 2 coastal sites (Option 4 and 5) and 2 peripheral sites on the eastern and western edges of the Plan Area (Option 6 and 7). The siting options are outlined below in order of suitability:

- **Option 1** is the most central site with the highest level of access from the surrounding residential population and potential linkage with inland sports facilities and the coastal amenity and is accordingly supported as the optimum location for the school.
- **Option 2** and **3** are also well-located sites with potential for direct access from the new village street and residential population and are accordingly also considered as acceptable locations. Option 2 would be a more favourable site given its location within the residential growth area of the village. Option 3 is located on the edge of the existing village and could provide a new focal point and potential future growth point in the area.
- **Option 4** is on the coastal lands but potentially has good access from the new roundabout proposed on the R336. This site could be considered if the above centrally located site options were unavailable, provided that it could be demonstrated that any environmental impacts in this sensitive location could be minimised and/or mitigated.
- **Option 5** is also located on the sensitive coastal lands but with potentially difficult access, separated from the main population area by a section of the R336 that will not be bypassed and in the opposite direction to the predominant traffic flows.

- **Option 6** is located on the sensitive coastal lands in close proximity to the designated cSAC/SPA/pNHA sites and remote from the village centre. The site may, however, be open to consideration given that it is located in the direction of the predominant traffic flows into Galway City, has potential for clustering with the nearby Catholic Church, could potentially serve the school needs of nearby Knocknacarra residents and could benefit from access to the local environment, provided that potential environmental impacts can be fully addressed and it can be demonstrated that traffic flows are acceptable and public transport access can be maximised.
- **Option 7** is remote from the village centre population, separated from the main roads, on the edge of the Plan Area, in the opposite direction to the predominant traffic flows and which may be bisected by the proposed GCOB route. This site would be the least favourable location for the school.

Given the difficulty and expense involved in securing sufficient land in a village centre location for a new school site, it is proposed that all of the above options be considered but that the preference would be for one of the central site options, along the northern edge of the new Village Street, i.e. Option 1, 2 or 3. Option 1 would be considered the optimum location for a school and this site should be supported as the preferable option unless one of the alternative siting options was secured for the school and it was clearly demonstrated that this was a viable option.

With regard to the proposal by Scoil Sheamus Naofa regarding a site in the Rural Fringe area and the potential of this option in terms of accessibility via a greenway linkage, adequate land for expansion, agreement in principle of the landowner, etc., it is proposed that this option be included in the LAP. Sub-Issue 1AI provides greater detail on this sub-issue.

Site option 7 has been included in the LAP as a potential location for the national school but more central site options are considered preferable in terms of their location, proximity to the main residential concentration in the village, ability to be accessed via vehicles and pedestrians, linkage to surrounding facilities and amenities, etc. As a result of the difficulties in terms of providing access to the lands, the fact that they will be traversed by the proposed GCOB, their remoteness from the existing village centre and the fact that a significant portion of the lands are located outside of the GCOB and plan boundary, it is recommended that this option be removed from the LAP. Sub-Issue 1AK provides greater detail on this sub-issue.

Recommendation:

The following recommendations are made with regard to a new school and Objective CF1:

- It is recommended that Objective CF1 and associated provisions in the LAP be retained in order to provide for the delivery of a school site to serve the growing population in Bearna.
- It is recommended that an additional site option be included for a new primary school in the LAP in the Rural Fringe area to the north of the village centre, as proposed by Scoil Sheamus Naofa.
- It is recommended that primary school site option 7 be removed from the LAP for the reasons outlined above.

On the proposal of Comh O'Cuaig and seconded by Comh Ní Fhatharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report and to reprioritise the primary school sites as previously agreed.

2.7.4 Sub-Issue 7C – Sports and Recreation Facilities

Submitted By:

- No. 6 – Rory O'Donnellan (Barna United FC)

- No. 15 – Michael McDonagh (Basketball Club)
- No. 19 – Patrick Duane
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 33 – Betty Ní Hiarnáin (Barna/Furbo Hurling Club)
- No. 36 – Bomac, Crehan & Harris
- No. 41 – Mr. Joseph Murphy
- No. 45 – John McMyler
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 50 – Barna GAA Football Club
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh
- No. 73 – Grainne O’Donnellan
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 86 – Betty Kilbane
- No. 92 – Martin & Margaret Concannon
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A significant number of submissions have made reference to sports and recreation facilities and the proposals in the LAP in this regard. The main issues raised are as follows:

General:

- The majority of submissions received highlight the importance of sporting activities in the Bearnna area, the lack of adequate sports facilities to cater for the existing demand and the need to provide additional facilities to serve the growing population in Bearnna. A number of submissions attribute this to a failure on the part of GCC to provide adequate facilities to support the growth that has been permitted in the village.
- The main sporting activities identified include Gaelic football, soccer, tennis, hurling, handball, badminton, pitch & putt and angling. Submissions have been received from each of the clubs responsible for these sports together with a submission from Comharchumann Bhearna Teo (Barna Co-op), the umbrella sporting body in the area, and Scoil Sheamus Naofa highlighting the lack of facilities and outlining the requirements for additional facilities.
- A number of submissions have been received from landowners objecting to the site options identified in the LAP for the provision of sports and recreation facilities due to the loss of development land and the freezing of land from other development until such time as a site has been secured. This relates to site option 1, 2 and 4 identified in the LAP. Sub-Issue 1I, 1X, 1AG and 1AK provide greater detail on these sub-issues.
- A landowner has indicated a willingness to consider the provision of land for

community facilities on site option 1 in exchange for a cluster housing development on the remaining lands. Sub-Issue 1AJ provides greater detail on this sub-issue.

- A landowner with 35 acres of land in the northwest Rural Fringe area has requested that the subject lands be rezoned from Rural Fringe to Outer Village area and has indicated that he would be willing to make part of the lands available for community use. Sub-Issue 1Q provides greater detail on this sub-issue.

Barna Co-Op (Comharchumann Bhearna Teo):

- Submission from Barna Co-Op, aligned sports clubs (Barna GAA Football Club, Barna United Football Club, Barna Basketball Club, Barna Tennis Club, Barna Pitch & Putt Club, Loch Inch Angling Club) and Barna National School that highlights serious lack of facilities to support rapidly growing population in Bearna and lack of provision by GCC of adequate additional facilities required. Require financial backing of GCC to secure adequate amenity space.
- Draft LAP mentions development potential for 1 792 housing units from village core to coastal edge. This growth should not be considered by GCC until after the provision of amenity space as proposed by the Co-op.
- Barna Co-op applaud aspirations of LAP but have concerns regarding the lack of detailed costing, timelines and measurable objectives. The LAP should provide cost estimates, a definitive plan as to where a site or sites is to be procured and when it will be handed over. GCC should make a formal commitment in LAP to procure the recreational area of circa 80 acres. All 5 sports site options identified in LAP should be retained for sporting/amenity and should be stated intention to retain this zoning in future plans.
- Structure of GCC Development Contributions should be changed where percentage going to amenity is increased from one of lowest contributions nationally to one of highest. A €100 000 financial contribution per acre should be ring fenced for use in Bearna and an additional contribution based on number of dwellings should also be applied. Suggested that it be on a sliding scale from €65 000 per unit to €100 000 per unit depending on density (excluding one-off housing as defined by GCDP 2003-2009). A similar levy should also imposed on commercial developments, suggested on a floorspace basis. Propose that portion of commercial rates now collected in Bearna be set aside to assist voluntary groups to maintain and develop community facilities and amenities in Bearna.
- Propose that a Parks/Community Officer be appointed by GCC to coordinate funding and initiatives.
- Propose that wording of Policy 2.5.2A be changed to wording proposed by Barna Co-op.
- Propose that once a 50 acre block of land is chosen as amenity, then GCC should seek to negotiate the purchase of total site over time (draft plan and statement attached showing what can be achieved with this extent of land).
- A playground facility should be zoned in VC area with necessary parking facilities for children.
- LAP should contain a commitment by GCC to identify and purchase a replacement recreational facility for amenity lands which has had a CPO executed on it to accommodate new GCOB.

Barna GAA Football Club:

- Major growth of club over past 42 years has lead to serious lack of facilities, which is retarding the growth of club. Existing facilities in and out of Bearna wholly inadequate, club has been unsuccessful in trying to purchase land from local landowners in past.
- Club welcomes the fact that GCC recognises lack of sporting amenity facilities in Bearna and that previous policy with regard to zoning has failed. Facilities

required to cater for needs in short to medium term future (5-10 years) include: 5 full-size pitches, one with a spectator stand; 2 all-weather training pitches; 1 large multi-purpose gym with clubhouse, etc. However, club fails to see how arbitrary zoning of 5 sites will address pre-existing problems. Club consider that it will be almost impossible to obtain suitably large plots of land in Lap boundary due to cost and multiple ownership (site options 1-4). Propose that: GCC pursue zoning options that realistic; that GCC wholly or partly fund purchase of agreed lands via a development contribution levy and local contributions; that once purchased and developed, lands should be transferred directly to various sporting bodies in area or Barna Co-op on a long term lease, i.e. 150 years.

Barna United Football Club:

- Compliment GCC on production of most comprehensive document and delighted to see inclusion of proposal by Barna Co-op of a dedicated sports campus and fully support this project. Request that: GCC identify most suitable option having viewed all submissions and to acquire these lands, immediately, prior to any third parties; a definite proposal be implemented to acquire lands and that consultations be held with club until such time as a facility is in place; local sporting groups are committed to developing this facility; it is GCC's responsibility to provide facilities required.
- Outline required facilities including: 4 full size grass playing pitches, 2 future pitches; 1 full size all weather pitch, 4 half size all weather training pitches, indoor training facility/sports hall, etc.

Bearna Basketball Club:

- Bearna Basketball Club welcomes and supports Draft LAP, in particular the sections identifying the sporting and amenity needs.
- Submission highlights importance of basketball to various age groups in the area and the lack of availability of gyms/halls. The club supports the development of a Sports Campus as proposed by Barna Co-op, notes that Draft LAP has identified 5 possible sites and welcomes the provision of a sports campus in the Draft LAP. The club has an urgent need for at least 1 full size court with spectator and associated facilities, 2 outdoor courts will provide additional access, range and facilities for the sport and an extra full size court would be required in the long term in the Sports Campus.
- The club also needs a Sports/Community Hall in the immediate future to accommodate a full size playing court in the IV area similar to the present location of the national school as close to the residential area of Bearna as possible on a 2 acre site and that an adequate area for this facility be zoned recreational/amenity in the IV area.
- Submission suggests that all 5 sites identified in LAP retain their status subsequent to development of sports facilities in short term as they will be required in future as village expands.
- GCC should work together with community to provide a Sports Campus with facilities identified by Barna Co-op within lifetime of current LAP. GCC to work together with community to provide Community/Sports Hall in village centre as a matter of urgency.
- GCC should appoint an officer with specific responsibility for public spaces and provide a budget for development of such spaces.

Barna Tennis Club:

- Fully supportive of efforts of Barna Co-Op to establish sports complex, which should be as close to Barna village as possible, allowing ready access for people young and old by foot, bicycle, private or public transport. Proximity to village

centre will also allow for interaction with school, housing estates, etc. and connection to natural amenities of Barna pier and beach and associated future water sports activities. Dramatic population growth in Barna area in recent years, it is vital to secure the site for new sports complex and to commence development of indoor/outdoor facilities without delay.

- Facilities required include: 8 outdoor, floodlit, all-weather surface courts, 4 indoor tennis courts and associated facilities. Other sports facilities should also be considered for squash, badminton, handball, racquetball, etc.

Lough Inch Pitch & Putt:

- Have an existing 9 hole pitch & putt course on 4 acres but this will be affected by NRA road. Need to retain facility or get generous compensation given high cost of land and club not in financial position to purchase lands at current high prices.

Lough Inch Angling Group:

- Lough Inch is an important resource for fishing, recreation and wildlife. GCC should preserve access to lakeshore through Barna Co-Op lands and develop an amenity area north of GCOB on shore of Lough Inch on any lands that become available in future.

Scoil Sheamais Naofa:

- School has no facilities for sporting activity in area of school and use Barna Co-op playing pitch to north. School population has increased rapidly but have no space to continue to grow. Welcome Barna Co-Op plan to encompass all sporting facilities.

Barna/Furbo Hurling Club:

- Club has grown steadily since its establishment in 1992 but the lack of adequate facilities for Barna making training and playing increasingly difficult and need for additional playing facilities now urgent. Fully supportive of Barna Co-Op plan which would meet these requirements. GCC should take immediate action to alleviate difficulties and support growing population by providing facilities.

Response:

The relevant provision in the LAP regarding sports and recreation facilities is as follows:

Objective CF4 – Sports and Recreation Facilities

Support the provision of an appropriate level of sports and recreation facilities to service the needs of the local community. In particular, the Plan supports the proposals by An Comharchumann Bhearna (Barna Co-op) for a Sports Campus in Bearna. This facility should ideally be located on approximately 50 acres of land within the Plan Area and within reasonable walking/cycling distance of the village centre. The funding for this facility would need to be generated through development contributions, private funding, fund raising, etc.

There are only a limited number of suitable large land parcels remaining in the Plan Area to provide for significant sports and recreation facilities to serve the growing population in Bearna and there has been widespread support for these facilities identified through the public consultation process. It is therefore recommended that all of the site options identified be retained in the LAP. In addition, it is recommended that an additional option be include in the northwest Rural Fringe area where a landowner has indicated a willingness to make part of the lands available for community use (subject to development on the remainder).

Certain landowners request that the sports options be removed given concerns that lands will be frozen. Many of these seem to be concerned that they will not be able to provide sites for

family members. This is not the intention of the LAP and should be clarified. Others request residential development be permitted on the lands. This is not considered appropriate given the reasons outlined under Issue 1.

The LAP includes a contribution scheme intended to facilitate the delivery of lands and funds for the delivery of community facilities and amenities, infrastructure, etc. Further details on this are provided under Sub-Issue 7G and 12A.

The various sporting groups and Barna Co-op have identified a substantial list of required facilities and the Co-op has proposed that 80 acres be provided for a sports campus. This represents a major land requirement and would provide a substantial facility in the area that would undoubtedly be welcomed by the local sporting groups and the local community. Nonetheless, the Planning Authority must consider these proposals in the context of limited public resources and competing needs for funding. It should also be borne in mind that, whilst there are no up to date quantitative Irish standards for the provision of open space, the internationally recognised standard is 6 acres per 1000 population for sports and other open space needs. The Bearna area draws on a much larger population base that just those living within the Plan Area and it would be difficult to quantify exactly what number of people use the existing facilities in Bearna or would be served by the proposed sports campus. Nonetheless, it is considered that the proposal to provide 80 acres of land for this use would make it more difficult to deliver appropriate lands, would place an unsustainable burden on existing landowners in the area and has not been adequately substantiated based on the population base that would utilise these facilities.

The LAP would benefit from greater clarity regarding the sports and recreation facilities and associated site options and it is recommended that a new sub-section be added in Section 4.1.8 of the Development Management Guidelines dealing with sports and recreation facilities.

Recommendation:

No change recommended to Objective CF4.

It is recommended that the general location of the subject lands referred to in Sub-Issue 1Q be identified as a new sports site option, which will require amendments to the following parts of the LAP:

- Community Facilities text and drawing in Summary Document (Page v).
- Section 2.5.1 and MAP 2.5.2A in Development Strategy.
- Section 3.4.1 in Development Framework.
- TABLE D2 in Appendix D.

It is recommended that the following paragraphs be added to Section 4.1.8 of the Development Management Guidelines dealing with sports and recreation facilities:

Sports and Recreation Facilities

The provision of sports and recreation facilities shall be guided by the following:

- *Section 10.13 of the GCDP 2003-2009, which sets out the policies and objectives with regard to recreation and amenity, and other relevant policies, objectives and standards in the GCDP 2003-2009.*
- *SECTION 2.5 of this LAP and other relevant strategies, policies, objectives and guidelines in the Plan.*
- *The Galway City Recreation and Amenity Needs Study prepared for Galway City Council.*

Sports and recreation facilities should ideally be located within walking and cycling distance of existing residential communities. Suitable provision for the establishment of cycling and walking tracks should be made on the local road network and/or along the amenity network enabling safe travel to sports and recreation facilities.

The Planning Authority will support the proposals of An Comharchumann Bhearna (Barna Co-op) for a Sports Campus in Bearna. This facility should ideally be located on approximately 50 acres of land within the Plan Area and within reasonable walking/cycling distance of the village centre. The funding for this facility would need to be generated through development contributions, private funding, fund raising, etc.

The delivery of suitable and appropriate sports and recreation lands will be a requirement before further development of lands on the various sports and recreation sites identified within the LAP boundary is permitted, with the exception of agricultural uses and other community facilities and amenities identified in the LAP. Appropriate alternative uses may be considered on the sports and recreation site options identified once suitable lands have been delivered for sports and recreation facilities to serve the Bearna community to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. This would include other types of community facilities and amenities suitable to the location and landscape context, for example a burial ground, and local housing need developments.

On the proposal of Comh O'Cuaig and seconded by Comh Ni Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report and to reprioritise the sport sites options as previously agreed.

2.7.5 Sub-Issue 7D – Proposed Village Squares

Submitted By:

- No. 2 – Brian Forde, Patricia Condon, Pat Doyle & Patsy Heffernan
- No. 5 – Michael & Julie Conneely
- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 17 – John Folan & Michael Conneely
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

A number of submissions refer directly to the village squares proposed in the LAP or affect one of the sites identified for a village square. The main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- A site-specific proposal for two three-storey blocks has been received on a potential village square along the R336 in the Village Core area where buildings are generally restricted to a maximum of 2.5 storeys. Sub-Issue 1A provides greater detail on this sub-issue.
- Several submissions object to a particular village square at the western end of the new village street due to loss of the landowner's development land, impact on amenity of existing properties and lack of adequate access due to levels. Sub-Issue 1D provides greater detail on this sub-issue.
- A site-specific proposal from a group of residents along Pier Road proposes a village square/open space at the end of Pier Road on the eastern side of the road. Sub-Issue 1E provides greater detail on this sub-issue.
- The Coiste Pobal Bhearna submission proposes that Objective CF5 be amended to allow the location of village squares to be addressed at design stage on any substantial application in the Village Core, Inner Village and Outer Village areas.
- A submission notes that a village square or park should be developed in the

central area of the village.

Response:

The LAP objective with regard to village squares is as follows:

CF5 – Village Squares/Local Parks

Facilitate the creation of village squares and/or local parks along the main street (R336) and new village street to support the civic life and social interaction of the local community.

The village has a main street but there is no focal point in the village to facilitate public gathering and social interaction. The Plan supports the development of a village square or series of village squares along the main street (R336) and new village street. A number of potential sites have been identified and it is suggested that at least one be provided, preferably one on each street.

The provision of Village Squares is considered an important facility to improve the public realm in Bearna, to provide for meeting/gathering places in the village and to provide relief from an intensive streetscape along the new village street (and avoidance of the creation of a 'tunnel effect' identified by local residents as problematic along the R336 main street).

It is not considered appropriate to leave the identification of provision until design stage as the LAP should be providing guidance on this issue to assist the public, landowners and developers in understanding the approach of the local authority on this issue and the implications for specific sites and in informing the local authority's decision-making on applications to ensure that one or more of these facilities are provided to improve the quality of the public realm in Bearna. It should also be noted that the provision of a village square might provide opportunities for developers to increase the intensity of development around the square over and above the general provisions in the LAP given that it will provide a new focal point within the village.

The response received from the Conservation Officer notes that the location and design of village squares should take into account the character of the existing village and important views to and from the village, such as from the roadway in front of the primary school towards the pier and the shores of Co. Clare beyond. As there are suggestions for the provision of a marina, which would greatly increase water-based travel, it is suggested that the implications of any village squares be considered from the Galway Bay view-point also.

It is accordingly considered appropriate that the site options identified be retained as proposed in the Draft LAP to provide sufficient options to enable a Village Square site to be delivered in the future along the new village street. Nonetheless, it is recommended that, in order to provide additional site options for the provision of Village Squares along the new village street and the coastal edge, that the proposed central school site options along the new village street and the water-related facility site options identified along the coast within the Village Core area also be considered as potential site options for Village Squares.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following changes be made with respect to providing additional site options for Village Squares and highlighting the benefits of village squares:

- The final sentence of Objective CF1 be amended (as highlighted in bold) to read as follows: "In the interim, these sites should be reserved as amenity areas and could be considered for the development of parks, **village squares** and other appropriate public uses.
- Objective CF5 be amended (as highlighted in bold) to read as follows: *Facilitate*

the creation of village squares and/or local parks along the main street (R336), new village street and other appropriate locations to support the civic life and social interaction of the local community and to improve the public realm and provide focal points within the village. A number of potential siting options have been identified and these should be considered together with any other suitable sites, such as the school site options and water-related facilities site options identified in the Village Consolidation Zone, for the provision of village squares and/or local parks.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Comh O'Cuaig it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report.

2.7.6 Sub-Issue 7E – Water-Related Facilities/Marina

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the provision of water-related/marina facilities. The main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- LAP should provide for widening of Silver Strand Road from R336 and adequate parking in County area adjacent to Silver Strand to support water-related facilities mentioned on Page 31 of Draft LAP.
- Marina site identified to west of pier is not feasible due to prevailing winds, quality of sea bed and absence of man made shelter and will destroy only sandy beach in village centre. Marina should be to east of pier.
- Draft LAP proposes marine based leisure facilities near Bearna Pier, which is a welcome development and vital to future growth of Bearna as a village with a proud maritime heritage. There is a natural breakwater west of pier and GCC should undertake a study of the area to determine the appropriate setting and scale of the new harbour. GCC should actively pursue the enhancement of harbour and new extended harbour as outlined by Coiste Ceibe Bhearna in their submission.
- The existing harbour is very small and very busy at peak times and more and better facilities are urgently required at the harbour, including adequate security lighting, car parking, toilet facilities and other amenities. There are 3 natural beaches that could, with a little effort, provide a significantly enhanced amenity in the area. Proposals for a short term tidal facility with enhancements of existing harbour (to include promenade, improvements to 2 beaches, reclaimed amenity space, seating area, etc.) and a longer term marine tourism and harbour development with a marina and deep-water berth (including 60 berth marina, 15ha of on-shore water facilities, etc.). A feasibility study should be undertaken to determine detail engineering design, environmental considerations, etc.

- Several submissions from coastal landowners request that water-related facilities should be located on lands outside foreshore field boundary. Sub-Issue 1S, 1T and 1V provide greater clarity on this sub-issue.
- Pobal Bhearna submission suggests that it would be better to locate proposed new marina facilities on east side of Pier. This would facilitate linkage of Pier Road and Mags Boreen with a public facility.
- Coiste Pobal Bhearna submission requests that wording on Page 31 and in Objective CF7 on Page 33 that water-related facility site opposite Silver Strand Beach should not include buildings or developments should be removed as water related facilities such as scuba diving, windsurfing club or seaweed baths facilities and tourism developments would require buildings and would benefit the community.
- Any large old fishing boats along pier that are out of commission should be removed from area. No litter bins along pier road or at pier – this must be addressed. Removal of seaweed from beach should be undertaken by GCC or OPW regularly.
- Marina/jetty option proposed to west of pier will require a breakwater or similar to make it feasible and this should be incorporated into LAP. Proposal for east of pier should incorporate an extension to pier to allow for its use at low water.

Response:

The relevant objectives in the LAP are as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

Objective CF8 – Jetty/Marina Development

Consider the provisions of the Development Strategy for Marine and Leisure Infrastructure produced by the Marine Institute and the need for a feasibility study for the project. This should incorporate an engineering study and a cost benefit analysis and should determine whether the project would provide positive economic and social benefits to the region and that it would be viable in the long term.

It is not considered appropriate to locate water-related facilities, apart from those with a need for direct connection with the sea (such as a slipway or marina), seaward of the foreshore wall for the following reasons:

- This would require costly coastal protection infrastructure and result in increased maintenance and repair costs to the local authority to maintain this infrastructure.
- It would limit public access to the seashore and potentially obstruct parts of the coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and/or seaside greenway linkages.
- It would interrupt the scenic quality of the coastal edge and run counter to best practice with regard to the location of these types of facilities.

It is considered inappropriate to allow building developments on the coastal lands adjacent to Silver Strand beach for the following reasons:

- The Silver Strand beach amenity serves Bearna and the broader City and County area and the protection of the amenity and environmental quality of this facility is of critical importance.
- Tourism and other related building developments at the coast should be located within the Village Consolidation Zone where they can be adequately serviced, accessed and serve the main residential thresholds in the area.
- Building developments at Silver Strand would fundamentally alter the character of the area and would potentially have adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the public facility, the coastal landscape setting and the nearby Galway Bay SPA, SAC and NHA.

The response received from the Conservation Officer notes that Coiste Céibhe Bhearna stated the need for additional facilities be provided for the harbour, due to the small size of the existing pier. It should be noted that this pier was key in the siting and development of the village and is not only an essential part of the character of the village, but also a landmark in its own right, visible from the Galway approach on the R336. Additional facilities would improve the viability of the facility but any future proposals should take into account the historic character of the pier and its design, including in the design of new features, materials used and their siting. The environmental impact of proposed improvements such as dredging or breakwaters must be assessed, and their impact on the character and function of the village and proposed Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) analysed.

It is suggested that the wording of Objective CF7 be revised to provide greater clarity on the existing beaches in Bearna and that Objective CF8 be revised to provide greater clarity regarding a jetty/marina development, breakwaters and impacts.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the wording of Objective CF7 be revised as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include the retention and enhancement of existing sandy beaches, the establishment of new beach areas as appropriate and the development of clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

It is recommended that the wording of Objective CF8 be revised as follows:

Objective CF8 – Jetty/Marina/Breakwater Development

Support the preparation of a feasibility study for a jetty/marina development to the east or west of Bearna Pier and any necessary marine/foreshore works to facilitate public access to and use of the area around the pier, such as breakwaters. This should incorporate an engineering study and a cost benefit analysis and should determine whether the project would provide positive economic and social benefits to the local community and the broader region and that it would be viable in the long term. The study should also consider the potential

impacts of any proposal on the coastal environment and amenity, Bearna Pier and the Pier Road ACA and should be designed on a best practice basis to minimise environmental impacts, to optimise benefits to the local community and the broader region, to respect any existing rights of way to the shore and to be complementary to land based uses and activities, including the Pier Road ACA, the proposed coastal amenity park and associated facilities. On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Comh Ní Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report.

2.7.7 Sub-Issue 7F – Amenity Network/Greenway Linkages

Submitted By:

- No. 4 – Mr. Raymond Storan
- No. 8 – Mrs. Mary Hernon
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 25 – Elizabeth Neville
- No. 39 – Tom & Claire Cunningham & Family
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 83 – Joseph Hernon
- No. 84 – Tadhg O hlarnáin
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues regarding the amenity network/greenway linkages proposed in the LAP. The main issues raised have been summarized as follows:

- A number of submissions have indicated support for the proposals for an amenity network of greenway linkages in the LAP, including submissions from some local residents and the Pobal Bhearna submission. These highlight the need for safe walking and cycling routes and the importance of an amenity network in providing these linkages.
- A number of submissions from landowners raise various concerns regarding the impact of the proposed greenway linkages on their property, including proximity to their residences, loss of privacy and security, loss of land for development, impact on agricultural activities and farm animals, potential anti-social behaviour, impact on seaweed rights, impact on local fauna and flora and waste of GCC resources. Some submissions propose that the route of the greenway linkage be relocated to take account of their properties and/or boundaries between existing landowners, that the greenway linkages have an adequate width, with a suggestion that 5m is adequate.
- Ecological Network map shows stream through the landowner's site and this stream should be properly surveyed (including the portion south of the site which is not shown on the map) and recorded on the map as there is a concern regarding surface water backing up if the lower site is developed in a manner that hinders the flow of the stream. Attached map shows stream on site and to south.
- Need to provide proper linkages across the GCOB to the Moycullen Bogs pNHA from the local roads. Attached map highlights need for linkage along

Paintbox/Avough Road.

- Draft LAP provides for a number of Greenway Linkages, which are welcome but with the following additions: GCC to cooperate with Galway City Council in providing a greenway linkage for cyclists and pedestrians along a coastal route to Galway City; and that existing boreens and stone walls be protected and retained wherever feasible.
- Object to seaside promenade proposed in Draft LAP due to impact on ecological biodiversity, birds and animals instead of a non-intrusive amenity walkway consisting of low-key pathways, which would help retain the coastal amenity. There is adequate shoreline outside of foreshore walls to develop suitable, non-intrusive walkways all along New Village and submitter would support such a development on condition that it does not damage the natural flora of the upper shore.
- Object to walkway of the size proposed in the Draft LAP along shoreline as the cost will be a waste of Council resources, the security of the submitter's house and neighbours would be seriously compromised, no EIS was carried out and the scenic and visual nature of the shoreline would be altered for the worse. If a walkway is necessary at all, it should be on the shore side of the boundary wall.
- A number of landowner's submissions request that the required open space in Village Core of 15% is inclusive of amenity park and greenway linkages and that the seaside promenade and associated facilities be located between the land boundary and HWM.
- Pobal Bhearna submission fully endorse establishment of an amenity network/greenway linkages. LAP should clearly indicate that cycle lanes should be in place along and adjacent to R336.
- Coiste Pobal Bhearna submission requests that existing boreen network should be restored to provide greenway linkages from sea to other plan areas, in preference to streamside greenways.
- Bog walk west of Golf Club is also wonderful natural amenity that must be protected and regularly monitored to protect from illegal dumping.
- If a new sewage line is needed, it should be gravity drained along coastline, incorporating a walkway from Bearna Pier to Silverstrand and beyond.
- DoEHLG submission notes that LAP deals with role of public transport and cycle ways in providing sustainable transport options for village. It is essential for sustainable development that LAP focus on providing key elements of public transport infrastructure in life of LAP such as for example an improved bus service or a cycle route.
- Submission objects to roadside greenway linkages as in some cases these are local boreens, not roads, which should not be tarred or hedgerows removed.

Response:

The relevant provisions in the LAP are as follows:

Objective CF14 – Streamside Greenway Linkages

Support the development of a Streamside Greenway Linkage loop along Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream that will link the future coastal amenity park and promenade to the new public square/park, public transport node and primary school site in the vicinity of the new village street and beyond to the future sports campus (and possible secondary school) and then further to the existing GAA playing pitch, Lough Inch, Fr. Griffin Memorial and Barna Golf Course. It could also connect to the Galway City greenway linkages and Barna Woods and would provide a safe walk around the Plan Area. New parks, playing fields and facilities located along stream walks. New developments to respond positively to streams, buffers and walks and not turn the backs on these features.

Objective NH7 – Local Streams

The existing streams in Bearna should be protected as follows:

- *Restore and reinstate streams or portions of streams that have been filled in or covered over as part of new developments.*
- *Culverting of the streams should be restricted.*
- *There will be a general minimum 6m wide buffer on either side of streams to protect these watercourse and associated habitats. Additional areas should be incorporated as required to provide for attenuation, habitat conservation, etc.*
- *A minimum 10m buffer for the Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream to protect the watercourse and associated habitats and to provide for the new main green spine, amenity linkage and north/south connection across the Plan Area.*

The above policies are considered necessary to provide for the protection of streams, their associated habitats and species, their ability to act as conduits for surface water and capacity to attenuate flooding and deal with environmental pollution, their contribution to the visual amenity of the landscape and the provision of a connected and continuous amenity network that provides safe walking routes for the local community and visitors to Bearna. These greenway linkages can also add value to new developments by providing high quality focal points for new developments and connecting developments to facilities and amenities in surrounding areas. As a result of the above, it is considered that a sufficient buffer width of 6m either side for streams and 10m either side for Truskey Stream and Liberty Stream is necessary to provide adequate space to allow for streams to fulfil the various roles outlined above.

The provision of these greenway linkages should, however, be located and designed in such a way that they do not unduly adversely impact on existing residential properties, agricultural uses or other activities that require a level of safety, privacy, amenity, etc. Alternative siting options should also be considered where necessary and appropriate. This should be clarified in the LAP through the addition of a new section covering greenway linkages in the Development Management section.

The proposal in relation to utilising boreens as linkages and following existing property boundaries is considered to have merit and will help to protect these elements of Bearna's heritage whilst providing for local linkages to the main amenity network. This should, however, be pursued in conjunction with the protection and use of the local streams, to provide for an interconnected network of amenity routes in Bearna. This should be clarified in the LAP.

It is acknowledged that there are different types of roadside greenway linkages (some alongside formal roads and others alongside boreens). It is accordingly suggested that these linkages be renamed Coastal Greenway Linkages in Objective CF15 to ensure clarity and avoid confusion.

The proposal that cycle lanes should be in place along and adjacent to R336 is a desirable aim but is currently restricted by the narrow width of this route and the volume of traffic using the main road. The options for providing a cycle lane may be more feasible once the GCOB is constructed and the extent of traffic is reduced. This issue is covered under Objective RT2, which states that cycling facilities should be provided wherever practicable. It is suggested that this also be referred to under Section 4.1.18 to provide greater clarity on this issue.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Objective CF15 be re-titled **Coastal Greenway Linkages** to ensure clarity and avoid confusion.

It is recommended that Policy 2.5.2B be revised through the insertion of an additional objective as follows:

CF17 – Local Linkages and Boreens

Support the provision of local linkages from significant new developments to the main amenity network. This could follow existing boreens, field/property boundaries or other routes as appropriate, subject to agreement from affected landowners.

It is recommended that Section 4.18 (on Page 106) be amended as follows:

Promenade and Greenway Linkages

At the end of this sub-section, add the following:

The provision of greenway linkages will be guided by the following:

- *The amenity network of greenway linkages shown on MAP 2.5.2B – Amenity Network is indicative and will be subject to more detailed consideration at the implementation/planning application stage.*
- *Amenity walkways should be designed as safe walking routes and, where possible, should also provide for cycling, particularly in the village centre and along the seaside.*
- *The design, construction and materials used for walkways should be low impact and sympathetic to the local environmental conditions and streamside and seaside greenway linkages in particular should seek to protect the adjacent streams/coastline and associated habitats and natural processes.*
- *Where planning applications are made on particular sites where greenway linkages have been identified, the applicant must clearly indicate the location of the linkage and include proposals for providing or retaining the route of the linkage and ensuring the protection of the stream/coastline and associated habitats and natural processes.*
- *Where suitable alternative routes/linkages to those indicated in the LAP can be demonstrated by the applicant that will provide for the continuity of the amenity network and the protection of streams/coastline and associated habitats and natural processes, then these can be considered on their merits. These alternative routes would need to be reserved, secured and/or developed as walkways, as appropriate to the particular location and circumstances.*
- *Connections should be provided between the amenity network and the road network to facilitate access and ease of movement. Pedestrian movement should be adequately catered for along the main roads, particularly in the village centre and between the village and Galway City, and cycling routes should also be provided wherever feasible.*

On the proposal of Cllr Welby and seconded by Comh Ni Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report but to amend objective NH7 Local Streams in the Plan by deleting the last bullet point.

2.7.8 Sub-Issue 7G – Delivery and Management of Community Facilities and Amenities

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 15 – Michael McDonagh (Basketball Club)
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 41 – Mr. Joseph Murphy

- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 97 – Board of Management of Scoil Sheamais Naofa, Bearna
- No. 98 – Mr. Larry Curran

Summary:

A number of submissions raise issues regarding the delivery and management of community facilities and amenities. The issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- Based on past experience, no reason to believe that contributions from future developments will fund amenities in village and benefit the village.
- GCC should work together with community to provide a Sports Campus with facilities identified by Barna Co-op within lifetime of current LAP. GCC to work together with community to provide Community/Sports Hall in village centre as a matter of urgency.
- Barna Co-op applaud aspirations of LAP but have concerns regarding the lack of detailed costing, timelines and measurable objectives. The LAP should provide cost estimates, a definitive plan as to where a site or sites is to be procured and when it will be handed over. GCC should make a formal commitment in LAP to procure the recreational area of circa 80 acres. All 5 sports site options identified in LAP should be retained for sporting/amenity and should be stated intention to retain this zoning in future plans. Barna Co-op submission proposes that once a 50 acre block of land is chosen as amenity, then GCC should seek to negotiate the purchase of total site over time (draft plan and statement attached showing what can be achieved with this extent of land). Structure of GCC Development Contributions should be changed where percentage going to amenity is increased from one of lowest contributions nationally to one of highest. A €100 000 financial contribution per acre should be ring fenced for use in Bearnna and an additional contribution based on number of dwellings should also be applied. Suggested that it be on a sliding scale from €65 000 per unit to €100 000 per unit depending on density (excluding one-off housing as defined by GCDP 2003-2009). A similar levy should also imposed on commercial developments, suggested on a floorspace basis. Propose that portion of commercial rates now collected in Bearnna be set aside to assist voluntary groups to maintain and develop community facilities and amenities in Bearnna. Propose that a Parks/Community Officer be appointed by GCC to coordinate funding and initiatives.
- A number of landowners have indicated that they would be willing to make lands available for community facilities and amenities, generally in exchange for a level of development on the remaining lands.
- A number of landowners have requested that the siting options identified for the various facilities be removed due to loss of development lands, impact on existing residences, freezing of lands, etc.
- Need public and private investment in delivering infrastructure and facilities to support development, achieve a high quality built and natural environment, avoid social, environmental and economic impacts, etc. A new section should be included in LAP on how these will be delivered.
- Pobal Bhearna submission strongly supports community facilities and amenities proposed in LAP but states that LAP requires an implementation plan that outlines the specific action points required before development can proceed. LAP provides no guarantees that amenity gains will accrue from future benefits. One way of providing amenities would be to require a developer (seeking planning permission for 4+ units) to make a contribution in excess of €100 000 per acre to a central

fund to be ring-fenced for provision of local amenities in Bearna. A mechanism for collection and administration of these funds should be outlined in LAP.

- Coiste Pobal Bhearna states that LAP will penalise the community of landowning families in Bearna as they will have to provide the land and/or money for community facilities and amenities in the interests of 'common gain', restrictive planning conditions will also not allow most of them to build second family homes or to sell sites and zoning of land for future school and sports uses will effectively freeze the use of the land until a final school or sports site is chosen. The net effect of the above is that the land is greatly devalued and the owners are therefore at a severe financial disadvantage. What is considered as being for Bearna's "common gain/good" must always suit the newly arrived resident of the area and thereby neglects the rights of those pre-existing Bearna families who have lived there for generations. The LAP is merely a capitulation to the views of the objector group Pobal Bhearna and rides roughshod over the rights of the native community of landowning families.
- No more significant development should be permitted until adequate infrastructure is put in place (community centre, school big enough, etc.).

Response:

The LAP has responded to the public consultation process undertaken in Bearna and supports the provision of a significant number of community facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna and to support the various sports activities within the Plan Area. The LAP provides a considerable level of detail with regard to these facilities, including the sites considered, criteria for selecting the optimum sites, the requirements for each type of facility, etc. The LAP also includes an Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme (Section 4.2.1) intended to deliver lands for facilities in suitable locations and provides details of specific projects required to support the provision of these facilities (Section 4.2.3).

It is, however, beyond the scope of a local area plan to provide detailed cost estimates for acquiring funds/lands and ensuring the delivery of facilities or amenities. This is dependent on the level of development that occurs and the resources available to GCC to implement projects or purchase lands and will occur on an incremental basis over time as the village grows and develops.

It is considered essential to include the various site options identified to provide a range of opportunities for providing these facilities to ensure delivery and to avoid penalising an individual landowner and instead spreading the cost (and benefit) of providing lands and/or funds for facilities. The willingness indicated by certain landowners to providing lands for facilities will need to be pursued on an ongoing basis to identify opportunities and progress proposals.

The LAP explicitly states under Section 4.2.1 that: *Any financial contributions will be ringfenced as part of a local fund to provide lands for community facilities, or as otherwise considered necessary by the Planning Authority, within the Bearna Plan Area.* This will ensure that contributions raised within the Bearna area will be invested back into the area. Nonetheless, the contribution scheme in the LAP would benefit from greater clarity and it is recommended that the wording of this section be refined.

The proposal that a Parks/Community Officer be appointed by GCC to coordinate funding and initiatives is likewise beyond the scope of the LAP and is a matter for the management and executive of GCC.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the wording of Section 4.2.1 be amended as follows:

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr. Mullins it was agreed to accept the recommendations in the Manager's Report. (as outlined below)

Cllr Welby stated that he was not in support of the Manager's Report, he explained that the financial assistance was still necessary and requested the Director to look at the long term. He added that it was not equitable that the development contribution for a house worth over €1m was the same as that for a house of considerable less value. Comh O'Cuaig supported Cllr Welby.

*A vote was taken on Comh Ní Fhatharta's proposal and the result was as follows;
AR SON, Cllr Canney, Cllr. Conneely, Cllr M. Connolly, Cllr Hoade, Cllr Kyne, Cllr Mullins, Comh Ní Fhatharta Comh O'Tuairisg, Cllr. S. Walsh, (9)*

*AGHAIDH: Cllr Feeney, Comh. O'Cuaig, Cllr. Welby (3)
Gan Votáil: Cllr. D. Connolly, Cllr. Joyce, Cllr. Reilly, Cllr Willers. (4)
The Mayor declared Comh. O'Fhartharta's proposal carried.*

Section 4.2.1 Development Contributions and Bonds

General Development Contribution Scheme

A General Development Contribution Scheme has been prepared by GCC under Section 48 of the PDA 2000 that applies to County Galway and which came into effect on the 8th March 2004. The scheme provides that conditions on grants of planning permission may be included requiring the payment of a contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area, that is provided, or that it is intended will be provided, by or on behalf of GCC. Copies of the scheme are available at the Planning Office and on www.galway.ie. Regard shall be had to the General Development Contribution Scheme 2004 for County Galway, and any other such scheme as may be published by GCC in the lifetime of the Bearna LAP.

Bonds and Securities

The Planning Authority will require developers to provide a security or bond for the proper completion of proposals with particular emphasis on large residential developments. The security required will be linked to the amount of roads, footpaths, lighting services and open space proposed.

Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme

The LAP proposes that an Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme be made that applies specifically to the Bearna Plan Area. This scheme will facilitate the delivery of facilities and amenities to serve the local community and growing population in Bearna in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The scheme will be applied to new developments in the Bearna Plan Area and has been formulated in order to ensure that sufficient lands and/or funds can be generated to allow for an adequate level of facilities, amenities, infrastructure and services to be delivered to serve the specific development and the local community.

The proposed scheme will generally be applied on the basis of a minimum percentage of the total land area of the development site, to be contributed towards a general land bank for the provision of community facilities and amenities in suitable locations by GCC or other bodies as appropriate, or as otherwise required by the Planning Authority. The developer may also be required to provide the agreed facility or amenity on these lands, particularly where this forms an integral part of the overall development, such as a new greenway linkage, park or playground.

The extent of land contributed will be comprised of two main components. The first is an internal open space requirement integral to the development, which has typically been a minimum of 10 to 15% as set out under the *Residential Density Guidelines 1999*. The second is an additional requirement for the provision of community facilities and amenities and will generally range from 10 to 15%.

The combined land contribution required will typically range from a minimum of 20% to 30% of the land area and will be graded according to the Development Areas identified in recognition of the higher land costs in more central areas and the need to encourage the delivery of lands in the most suitable locations to make facilities and amenities more central and accessible to the local community and users that they serve and in the interests of promoting greater equity. This scheme will allow better use to be made of the lands acquired under the general open space provisions of the *Residential Density Guidelines 1999* and to allocate the lands to ensure that the optimum balance can be achieved between a high quality development layout with adequate internal open space and the delivery of lands for community facilities and amenities to serve the development and the local community.

The minimum land contribution requirement will be calculated in accordance with TABLE 4.2.1 below. The table also provides an indication of the types of community facilities and amenities that would be suitable in each area, although other options may also be considered, as outlined in SECTION 2.5.

TABLE 4.2.1 Development Contribution by Development Area		
Development Area	Minimum Contribution	Suitable Community Facilities and Amenities
Village Core	20% of total site area	Coastal Amenity Park & Seaside Promenade Community/Youth Centre Water- Related/Based Facilities (e.g. marina) Childcare Facilities & Children's Playground Public Transport Node/Village Square Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Inner Village	25% of total site area	National School Community/Youth Centre Sports Facilities & Public Parks Public Transport Node/Village Square Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Outer Village	25% of total site area	National School Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Rural Fringe	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Green Wedge	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities

Coastal Edge	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities Water-Related Facilities (limited, low-impact)
---------------------	------------------------	---

Note:

- 1. In cases where the site provided is not as central or suitable as required under the Plan or where a higher density than is specified in the Plan is permitted, then a greater proportion of the lands may need to be provided for the delivery of community facilities and amenities.*
- 2. In cases where strategic sites or major facilities are provided for the local community, GCC may consider increased densities and a greater mix of uses, as appropriate to this new focal point in the Plan Area and in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development. An example of where this might be considered includes site option 1, 2 or 3 for a new school.*

The Planning Authority will require developers/applicants to enter into legally binding agreements securing the agreed lands, to the requirements of the Planning Authority. Landowners and developers will be encouraged to undertake pre-planning discussions with the Planning Authority in order to identify opportunities for providing suitable sites and/or facilities and to work towards the necessary agreements on how these will be delivered.

The use of Master Plans will also be required with all large development proposals to show the locations, nature and scale of development and the manner in which appropriate types and locations of community facilities and amenities are to be delivered. Landowners will be encouraged to work together to submit group proposals for aggregated land parcels that provide optimum solutions to the provision of community facilities and amenities balanced against an appropriate level, layout and design of development.

The Planning Authority may consider the contribution of other lands that do not form part of the development site but which are under the control of the applicant, provided it is considered by the Planning Authority to be in an appropriate location in the Plan Area for the delivery of well-located, accessible facilities and that legally binding agreements are put in place, to the requirements of the Planning Authority. This will be calculated at a similar level to that which applies to the development site (excluding the 10 to 15% required for internal open space) where it is in a suitable location or at a higher scale where the location is not as central or suitable as the development site.

The use of financial contributions will only be considered where the Planning Authority is satisfied that appropriately located lands cannot be delivered and/or assembled and it is in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development. This financial contribution will generally be calculated on the basis of a minimum of 15% of the market value of the lands for which permission is being applied assuming that it has the benefit of planning permission. Any financial contributions generated under this scheme will be ring-fenced as part of a local fund to provide lands for community facilities, or as otherwise considered necessary by the Planning Authority, within the Barna Plan Area. Appropriately located, designed and landscaped internal open space will still be required within development sites in accordance with applicable policies, objectives and guidelines.

2.7.9 Sub-Issue 7H – Existing of Community Facilities and Amenities

Submitted By:

- No. 6 – Rory O'Donnellan (Barna United FC)
- No. 15 – Michael McDonagh (Basketball Club)
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)

- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 33 – Betty Ní Hiarnáin (Barna/Furbo Hurling Club)
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 73 – Grainne O'Donnellan
- No. 93 – Barna Handball Club

Summary:

A significant number of submissions raise issues regarding the existing facilities and amenities in Bearna. The issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- A number of submissions state that the existing facilities are not adequate to deal with existing demand and that it is the responsibility of GCC to rectify this situation.
- GCC have not provided any of the 15 existing facilities in the Bearna area it is not acceptable that village grows further without the necessary facilities.
- LAP should contain a commitment by GCC to identify and purchase a replacement recreational facility for amenity lands that have a CPO for the new GCOB.
- The existing handball alley is not disused (as stated in LAP) and this should be corrected.

Response:

The LAP has acknowledged the inadequacy of existing facilities to deal with demand for the rapidly growing population in Bearna and has put forward proposals to address this issue (see above). The provision of lands or facilities is dependent on public and private and investment, the initiatives of local groups, interaction with the relevant departments of the local authority and nationally, etc. and the LAP can only provide a framework for the provision of these facilities and the delivery of specific projects will need to be undertaken on an ongoing basis once the LAP has been adopted.

It is acknowledged that the text in the LAP regarding the handball alley should be amended to correctly reflect the use of this existing facility.

Recommendation:

No change recommended to Objective CF4.

It is recommended that the reference in the LAP to the handball alley being disused be removed (Table 2.5.1 and Table 2.6.2C).

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhatharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.7.10 Sub-Issue 71 – Existing School Site/Proposed Community Centre/Sports Hall

Submitted By:

- No. 15 – Michael McDonagh (Basketball Club)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford

- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

The main issues raised regarding a community centre/sports hall have been summarised as follows:

- The Basketball Club needs a Sports/Community Hall in the immediate future to accommodate a full size playing court in the Inner Village area similar to the present location of the national school as close to the residential area of Bearna as possible on a 2 acre site and that an adequate area for this facility be zoned recreational/amenity in the Inner Village area.
- Existing school should be kept as centre for older generation in Bearna and not developed into more apartment blocks.
- A number of submissions support the need for a community/youth centre and many state that the existing school site should be kept for community use when the new school is built. The Pobal Bhearna submission fully supports proposal in LAP to establish a community centre on existing primary school site, when Scoil Sheamais Naofa is moved to a new location.
- A submission notes that the proposal to provide community based facilities on existing school site might militate against a public/private partnership option for building school in terms of a land swap.
- A submission notes that the closest WHB clinical services are in Moycullen but this is not served by public transport and the submission notes that the existing school site could be used by WHB to facilitate Barna/Furbo area.

Response:

The LAP objective with regard to a community/youth centre is as follows:

CF2 – Community/Youth Centre

Support the retention of the existing national school site for community use once the existing school has been relocated to an appropriate site. The existing site should be redeveloped as a multi-purpose community centre providing a range of facilities for the local community, including community meeting rooms, youth facilities, games rooms, senior citizens facilities, a leabharlann/Gaeltacht centre, Gaelic classes, Irish dancing, aerobics and other sports, such as indoor soccer, etc.

The above is considered necessary to provide this important facility in a central location where it can be easily accessible by the large concentration of the community in the village centre. It is also intended to be a multi-purpose facility that can serve a range of needs in the community, including those of the youth, the elderly, sports, dancing, Irish, etc. Section 4.1.8 provides for alternative sites to be put forward for this facility provided they have an appropriate location, size, level of accessibility, etc. This will allow a necessary degree of flexibility in the plan framework. It is suggested that an additional sentence be included at the end of this sub-section to clarify the matter and to accommodate other facilities, such as a clinic, or development options.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the last sentence under Community/Youth Centre in Section 4.1.8 be amended as follows (highlighted in bold):

In the event that the national school is not relocated and/or alternative sites are put forward for the proposed community centre, the Planning Authority may consider these options subject to an appropriate village core location, adequate access and linkages, site size and

context, etc. *Provided sites are secured for the school and community/youth centre, alternative options could be considered for the existing school site, such as a local clinic. On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Kyne it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.*

2.7.11 Sub-Issue 7J – Youth Facilities

Submitted By:

- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 25 – Elizabeth Neville
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the need for facilities for the youth. Some of these note the need for a community/youth centre to cater for the youth whilst others highlight the need for a range of sports facilities. Some submissions support the provisions of the LAP in supporting the provision of facilities for the youth.

Response:

The LAP supports the provision of facilities for the youth, including the community/youth centre, sports and recreation facilities, playgrounds and pitches, walking and cycling routes, water-based facilities and activities, a new national school, etc.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr Kyne and seconded by Cllr Walsh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report but to also allow for tourist related uses in the coastal edge development area

2.7.12 Sub-Issue 7K – General Community Facility and Amenity Proposals in Draft LAP

Submitted By:

- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 54 – Brid Walsh
- No. 55 – Maureen Walsh
- No. 56 – Michael Walsh
- No. 57 – Larry Walsh
- No. 59 – Margaret Walsh
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 71 – Larry, Michael, Margaret & Brid Walsh

Summary:

A number of submissions refer directly to the proposals in the LAP with regard to community facilities and amenities and either support or object to the proposals contained therein or propose changes to specific facility or implementation proposals in the LAP. The main issues raised are as follows:

- A number of submissions from local residents, sports groups and Pobal Bhearna

support the overall intentions and proposals in the LAP to provide lands and/or facilities and highlight the substantial need for these facilities.

- A number of landowners and the Coiste Pobal Bhearna submission object to the provisions in the LAP stating that they will be losing development land, that GCC should be funding facilities, etc.

Response:

These issues have been covered under Issue 1 and other sub-issues under Issue 7 above.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Kyne it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report and to include a library as part of the Community Facilities.

2.7.13 Sub-Issue 7M – Public Buildings

Submitted By:

- No. 51 – Daragh O'Tuairisg & Aine Feeney McTigue

Summary:

The submission states that GCC should make provision for public buildings in the Village Core/Inner Village area, e.g. health centre, GCC office, Gardai Station, etc.

Response:

The LAP refers extensively to the support for community facilities and amenities and this is enshrined in the objectives for the Village Core and Inner Village areas. It is considered appropriate to include specific reference to public uses in these areas and it is proposed that the word public be inserted into the mix of uses allowed under Objective LU3 and LU4.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the word public be inserted into the mix of uses allowed under Objective LU3 and LU4 for the Village Core and Inner Village areas.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr O'Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.7.14 Sub-Issue 7N – Cemetery and Future Crematorium

Submitted By:

- No. 67 – Per. Reps of the O'Dwyer Est C/O Kennedy Fitzgerald Solicitors (refer to Sub-Issue 1Z)

Summary:

Detailed submission that makes a case for a burial ground site and possible future crematorium adjoining the northeast boundary of LAP outside the Plan Area and request a site specific objective be included in the plan to support this proposal. The submission notes that:

- There is currently a shortfall in burial grounds in Bearna and Galway City and limited capacity in Galway City's two existing burial grounds.
- The population of Bearna and Galway is increasing rapidly.
- The subject site is suitably located for such a facility (within the Galway

Metropolitan Area, close to the major concentrations of population, well served by a strategic road network and accessibility will improve with proposed GCOB, in an area with an evolving public transport network, in close proximity to Bearna Church, etc.) and is suitable for the provision of such a facility in accordance with available UK guidelines.

- The land is in single ownership, which will ensure its immediate and coherent development.

Response:

Objective CF4 – Sports and Recreation Facilities

Support the provision of an appropriate level of sports and recreation facilities to service the needs of the local community. In particular, the Plan supports the proposals by An Comharchumann Bhearna (Barna Co-op) for a Sports Campus in Bearna. This facility should ideally be located on approximately 50 acres of land within the Plan Area and within reasonable walking/cycling distance of the village centre. The funding for this facility would need to be generated through development contributions, private funding, fund raising, etc.

The provision of adequate sports and recreation facilities to serve the growing population in Bearna is one of the major issues identified through the public consultation process. The LAP has identified a number of site options for these facilities, including site option 2 which covers part of the subject lands. It is essential that these sites be reserved until such time as a suitable site or sites can be provided for sports and recreation facilities.

Nonetheless, the provision of a burial ground and associated facilities could be considered on site option 2 as it could form part of the proposed Green Wedge buffer area and could potentially be located alongside sporting facilities. The priority in the LAP, however, would be the provision of sports and recreation facilities to serve the local community. It is also not considered appropriate to include a specific objective in the LAP for lands outside of the plan boundary.

Nonetheless, the LAP would benefit from greater clarity regarding the sports and recreation facilities and associated site options and it is recommended that a new sub-section be added in Section 4.1.8 of the Development Management Guidelines dealing with sports and recreation facilities.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following paragraphs be added to Section 4.1.8 of the Development Management Guidelines dealing with sports and recreation facilities:

Sports and Recreation Facilities

The provision of sports and recreation facilities shall be guided by the following:

- Section 10.13 of the GCDP 2003-2009, which sets out the policies and objectives with regard to recreation and amenity, and other relevant policies, objectives and standards in the GCDP 2003-2009.
- SECTION 2.5 of this LAP and other relevant strategies, policies, objectives and guidelines in the Plan.
- The Galway City Recreation and Amenity Needs Study prepared for Galway City Council.

Sports and recreation facilities should ideally be located within walking and cycling distance of existing residential communities. Suitable provision for the establishment of cycling and

walking tracks should be made on the local road network and/or along the amenity network enabling safe travel to sports and recreation facilities.

The Planning Authority will support the proposals of An Comharchumann Bhearna (Barna Co-op) for a Sports Campus in Bearna. This facility should ideally be located on approximately 50 acres of land within the Plan Area and within reasonable walking/cycling distance of the village centre. The funding for this facility would need to be generated through development contributions, private funding, fund raising, etc.

The delivery of suitable and appropriate sports and recreation lands will be a requirement before further development of lands on the various sports and recreation sites identified within the LAP boundary is permitted, with the exception of agricultural uses and other local community facilities and amenities identified in the LAP. Appropriate alternative uses may be considered on the sports and recreation site options identified once suitable lands have been delivered for sports and recreation facilities to serve the Bearna community to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. This would include other types of community facilities and amenities suitable to the location and landscape context, for example a burial ground, and local housing need developments.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report but to change 'may' to 'shall' in the last paragraph of Section 4.1.8 of the Development Management Guidelines dealing with Sports and Recreation Facilities.

2.7.15 Sub-Issue 70 – Caravan Park

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon

Summary:

The above submission states that the Caravan Park in the City area is being converted to Lough Rusheen Amenity Parks by Galway City Council and drawing needs to be amended.

Response:

Map 2.3.1 in the LAP shows a caravan park to the east of the Bearna LAP boundary. This facility has been replaced with an amenity park under the management of Galway City Council and the map should accordingly be amended.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Map 2.3.1 be amended by replacing the area shown as 'Caravan Park' with 'Open Space/Recreation & Amenity'.

On the proposal of Comh O' Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8 Issue 8 – Heritage and Environment

2.8.1 Issue 8 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna
- No. 26 – Kevin Rodgers (WRFB)
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others

- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O’Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 65 – Mr. Sean Boland
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 84 – Tadhg O hIarnáin
- No. 85 – Eileen & Joseph Hernon
- No. 87 – Anne Davey
- No. 88 – Margaret & Tommy Gannon
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

A total of 22 submissions have been received in relation to the heritage and environment in Bearna and/or the associated proposals in the LAP.

2.8.2 Sub-Issue 8A – Coastal Amenity/Coastal Development Setback

Submitted By:

- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O’Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 65 – Mr. Sean Boland
- No. 80 – Patrick Gill
- No. 84 – Tadhg O hIarnáin
- No. 85 – Eileen & Joseph Hernon
- No. 87 – Anne Davey
- No. 88 – Margaret & Tommy Gannon
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

A significant number of submissions have been received in relation to the coastal amenity/coastal development setback. Where these relate to the coastal amenity park proposed in the Village Core, they have been dealt with under Sub-Issue 7A above. Where they relate to the general coastal amenity and the setbacks proposed in the Coastal Edge, they have been dealt with under this sub-issue. The main issues raised have been summarized as follows:

- A more definitive, larger and formal coastal amenity zone is needed and Village Core area should be setback to between R336 and new village road.
- Coastal edge area should not be reduced.
- Several submissions, mainly from landowners and Coiste Pobal Bhearna, state that setback is too great and that Objective NH34 should be deleted and replaced

with new wording that coastal amenity zone be from land boundary to HWM for coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and associated facilities. Submissions cite that 100m is unfair, that it will prevent development, including local housing need, that habitats are not of high value, etc.

- Remove wording in Policy NH34 on Page 60 that no development seaward of Lenarevagh Stream in eastern portion of Coastal Edge as this would prohibit water-related facilities such as a scuba club, windsurfing club, seaweed baths facilities and tourism developments.
- Maintaining pier, beach and foreshore as a natural amenity is essential to character of area.
- Some landowners acknowledge the need for a coastal strip to protect the coastal amenity but request that this be reduced, some stating that it should be 10m.
- A submission notes that Wexford CDP 2007-2013 which came into force on 30th April 2007 states as follows: "Objective CZ4 – Prohibits any new building or development including caravans and temporary dwellings within 100m of soft shoreline". GCC should apply same objective in Bearna LAP.
- DoEHLG submission notes that LAP is opening all areas in village for development including seaward side of R336, albeit at low density and high design criteria. GCC should ensure that this is consistent with policy in Section 3.24 and 3.25 of GCDP which states that "views of Galway Bay, North Clare Coast and the Aran Islands from the coastal road (R336) have been obscured in many places by mixed development. There are pockets of this landscape, which command striking seaward views; hence development of all kinds should be prohibited. Further development within this area should be grouped in clusters, close to existing settlements and should avoid the seaward side of the R336 road to avoid further visual obstruction of the scenic coastline". GCC should ensure that proposals for village are consistent with these policy provisions in GCDP.

Response:

The relevant objectives in the LAP are as follows:

Objective NH33 – Coastal Development Setback

Establish an appropriate coastal development setback appropriate to local conditions and requirements to:

- *Protect the sensitive coastal edge, coastal habitats and natural processes from destruction, degradation and/or disruption to ensure that their roles as ecological corridors, coastal flooding and storm surge buffers are retained and enhanced.*
- *Maintain and improve public access to the seashore and the utilisation of the coastal edge as a focus for public use and recreation.*
- *Provide a buffer to protect against coastal flooding and erosion and the increasing incidence and severity of storm surges, flooding and erosion that is likely to result from global warming and sea level rises.*
- *Allow sufficient space for the development of important public infrastructure and amenities, such as a promenade, public ablutions, park areas, etc.*
- *Provide for the creation of a positive relationship between new built development, the coastal amenity park, the promenade and the seashore.*

Objective NH34 – Coastal Edge

An appropriate coastal development setback will be required as follows in the Coastal Edge area:

- *A minimum horizontal setback of 100m from the foreshore field boundary line for new development or along the 10m natural contour line, whichever is the greater.*

- *A consideration of the permanent line of vegetation and the 200 year tide level in the layout, design and installation of any new development, infrastructure or landscaping.*
- *A high quality of siting and design in the area between the 100m setback/10m contour line and the R336.*
- *No development seaward of Lenarevagh Stream in the eastern portion of the Coastal Edge.*

The coastal amenity is probably the major asset of Bearna and its protection is accordingly afforded a high priority in the LAP. The area as proposed performs a number of important roles in the Plan Area, including amongst others:

- A scenic amenity for Bearna that protects the landscape character and setting of the village and that provides for views over Galway Bay.
- A potential area for community facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna.
- A landscape, environmental and visual asset that forms an important part of the character and setting of the village.

The use of coastal development setbacks is a widely used approach to protect coastal amenities, provide for public access to the seashore, allow for appropriate development, etc. This approach is used both within Ireland and more broadly in Europe, America, etc. The use of 100m coastal development setbacks are used in other countries to protect coastal lands and have recently been incorporated in the Wexford County Development Plan 2007-2013 (Policy CZ3). The use of a 3m setback above the HWM is used in other countries and has also recently been incorporated in the Wexford County Development Plan 2007-2013 (Policy CZ4).

The coastal habitat study has identified important and protected habitats in areas along the coastal amenity. The SEA report has also identified the need to protect the coastal edge and amenity and has proposed mitigation measures to ensure that these areas are protected to avoid significant environmental effects. The SEA proposes the following mitigation measure to protect the coastal amenity:

MM12

Protect the coastal edge and coastal habitats from destruction and degradation to ensure that their roles as ecological corridors, coastal flooding and storm surge buffers are retained and enhanced and request that developers proposing developments in the vicinity of this area be requested to carry out an ecological survey and submit an ecological plan that incorporates the natural vegetation and topography of the area.

The provisions in the SEA have been considered in the LAP and the coastal development setback is considered an essential part of protecting the amenity, landscape, habitats and wildlife coastal edge and to preserve the area for public access, water-based activities, amenity walks, etc.

It is acknowledged that the last bullet point in the Objective NH34 may be interpreted as restricting all development, including certain developments that the LAP would support, such as an improved beach amenity at Silver Strand. The wording should accordingly be amended in the interests of clarity. This should not allow for building developments on these lands, for the reasons outlined earlier.

Recommendation:

No change recommended in relation to Objective NH33.

It is recommended that the final bullet point in Objective NH34 be amended to read as follows (as highlighted in bold):

- *No development seaward of Lenarevagh Stream in the eastern portion of the Coastal Edge, other than as permitted under other sections in the LAP or as considered by the Planning Authority to be in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.*

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhatharta and seconded by Comh O'Tuairisg it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report and to also amend Objective NH35 as follows, to delete the word 'minimum' in the first bullet point and the word 'absolute' in the second bullet point and to add a third bullet point to read as follows, 'Alternative innovative high quality design solutions may be considered where it delivers a coastal amenity park, seaside promenade and associated facilities.'

Comh O'Cuaig stated that he did not support the Manager's Report

A vote was taken on Comh Ní Fhatharta's proposal and the result was as follows; AR SON, Cllr Canney, Cllr. Conneely, Cllr Hoade, Cllr. Joyce, Cllr Kyne, Cllr. McHugh, Cllr Mullins, Comh Ní Fhatharta Comh O'Tuairisg, Cllr. Reilly, Cllr. S. Walsh, Cllr Welby(12)

*AGHAIDH: Cllr Feeney, Comh. O'Cuaig, Cllr. Willers (3)
Gan Votáil: Cllr. D. Connolly,.(1)
The Mayor declared Comh.O'Fhartharta's proposal carried.*

2.8.3 Sub-Issue 8B – Watercourses

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 26 – Kevin Rodgers (WRFB)
- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The above submissions refer to watercourses and streams in the Bearna and the main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- Minimum culverting of streams will be needed to facilitate access to lands severed by streams and to back lands.
- The WRFB submission notes that there are a number of small streams of local significance in Plan Area that support small populations of wild brown trout and eel. Truskey Stream also flows into Galway Bay, a SAC. Flow of streams needs to be maintained, particularly during drought periods and water quality needs to be fully protected. A comprehensive assessment is needed of fish populations in watercourses. It appears from scale of development envisaged that fish populations will be completely eliminated.
- Buffer should be reduced (from 6m and 10m for Truskey Stream and Liberty Stream) to 5m on either side of all streams in Policy NH7 on Page 57.

Response:

The LAP objective in relation to streams and watercourses is as follows:

Objective NH7 – Local Streams

The existing streams in Bearna should be protected as follows:

- *Restore and reinstate streams or portions of streams that have been filled in or covered over as part of new developments.*
- *Culverting of the streams should be restricted.*
- *There will be a general minimum 6m wide buffer on either side of streams to protect these watercourse and associated habitats. Additional areas should be incorporated as required to provide for attenuation, habitat conservation, etc.*
- *A minimum 10m buffer for the Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream to protect the watercourse and associated habitats and to provide for the new main green spine, amenity linkage and north/south connection across the Plan Area.*

The above policies are considered necessary to provide for the protection of streams, their associated habitats and species, their ability to act as conduits for surface water and capacity to deal with environmental pollution, their contribution to the visual amenity of the landscape and the provision of a connected and continuous amenity network that provides safe walking routes for the local community and visitors to Bearna. These greenway linkages can also add value to new developments by providing high quality focal points for new developments and connecting developments to facilities and amenities in surrounding areas.

The buffers provided for the stream are considered necessary to allow the streams to fulfil all of their various roles, including as water conduits and attenuation areas (to help prevent flooding, etc.), areas for habitat protection and corridors for wildlife movement, scenic amenities providing relief from the built environment, amenity walking areas for human use, etc. The width provided for under the LAP is considered necessary to enable all of the above functions to be catered for.

It is not within the scope of the LAP to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the fish populations in all the streams in Bearna. Nonetheless, the LAP provides a range of measures that will help to protect fish populations and water quality in streams. These have been addressed through the provisions of the LAP in respect of stream buffers, controls on wastewater disposal and requirements for significant developments to consider environmental impacts as part of the planning application.

The measures proposed in the LAP are also in response to the mitigation measures proposed in the SEA Report to minimise environmental impacts and to provide adequate safeguards to ensure the protection of the key environmental resources in and adjacent to the Plan Area. The main mitigation measures (MM) proposed in the SEA in relation to watercourses are as follows:

MM4

Planning applications must: identify all ecological corridors (including hedgerows and masonry stone walls), likely to be significantly affected, which are present on the relevant lands; identify any losses to these corridors which would result if the application in question was granted, and; show that such losses would be fully offset if the application was to be granted through the replacement of the relevant corridors, with corridors composed of similar species or materials, before any losses to the existing corridors occur.

MM5

Reserve and develop the Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream as greenway linkages with pedestrian and cycling facilities linking the Inner Village Area, Outer Village Area and Rural Fringe to the coastal edge.

MM6

Prohibit the future channelling and piping of streams in Bearna,

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr Welby and seconded by Cllr S Walsh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report and to include the amendments already agreed in relation to Objective N7 Local Streams in the Plan

Cllr D Connolly expressed concern at decreasing the minimum buffer for the Truskey Stream and the Liberty Stream from 10m to 6m.

A vote was taken on Cllr Welby's proposal and the result was as follows;

AR SON, Cllr Canney, Cllr. Conneely, Cllr M. Connolly, Cllr Hoade, Cllr Hynes, Cllr Kyne, Cllr. McHugh, Comh Ní Fhatharta, Comh O'Cuaig, Comh O'Tuairisg, Cllr. Reilly, Cllr. S. Walsh, Cllr Welby(13)

AGHAIDH: Cllr.D. Connolly, Cllr Feeney, Cllr. Willers (3)

Gan Votáil: (0)

The Mayor declared Cllr Welby's proposal carried.

2.8.4 Sub-Issue 8C – Designated Sites

Submitted By:

- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The above submissions object to the proposed 30m buffer around environmental designations proposed in objective NH15 of the LAP. The first submission argues that these designations are already buffers in themselves whilst the second proposes a buffer of 5m around the designations.

Response:

The LAP objective in relation to environmental designations is as follows:

NH15 – Buffer Area

Establish an appropriate buffer around all environmental designations to protect them from land use and development impacts. This shall be determined on a site specific basis depending on local ecological and drainage conditions and other factors as appropriate and shall in no case be less than 30m in width. This shall apply along Silver Strand Road and the north-western corner of the Plan Area to protect these designated sites.

The above objective is considered necessary in order to protect these designations, which include the Galway Bay SAC, SPA and NHA on the eastern boundary of the Plan Area and the Moycullen Bogs NHA in the northwest corner of the Plan Area. These designations are of national and international importance and are protected under the EU *Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC)* and *Birds Directive 1979 (79/409/EEC)* and relevant Irish legislation including the *European Communities (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1997 (SI No. 94 of 1997)*, the *European Communities (Conservation of Wild Birds) Regulations 1985 (SI No. 291 of 1985)* and the *Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000*.

The SEA has also identified the need to protect these areas through the use of an appropriate buffer. The SEA provides for the following mitigation measures (MM) to protect these environmental designations:

MM1

Establish a buffer, free of development, at least 30m in width around designated wildlife sites which may be subject to an increase depending on local ecological and drainage conditions and other factors as appropriate.

MM2

Planning applications within 60 meters of designated wildlife sites must be accompanied by: an ecological assessment which complies with Section 18 of the European Communities (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1997 and which takes direct and indirect effects of the development on the designated site into account, and; evidence of consultation between the applicant and the National Parks and Wildlife Service with regard to the findings of this assessment. The need for ecological assessments for planning applications further than the 60 meter distance shall be decided upon on a site by site basis depending on local ecological and drainage conditions and other factors as appropriate.

MM3

Planning applications within the field to the southeast of the village centre and adjacent to the old shellfish holding area must be accompanied by: an ecological assessment which takes direct and indirect effects of the development on the designated site into account

The Lap has referred to the above mitigation measures under Section 4.1.9 and it is considered that objective NH15 would need to remain unchanged to be consistent with the recommendations of the SEA and the protection of the environmental designations. It should also be noted that the 30m buffer covers only a very small portion of the Plan Area and is limited to the southeast and northwest corners of the Plan Area.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report but to amend the following mitigation measures(MM) in the SEA Report, in MM1 change 30m to 10m and in MM2 change 60m to 30m

2.8.5 Sub-Issue 8D – Pier Road and Architectural Conservation Area

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty

Summary:

Several submissions refer to the proposed Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) along Pier Road or more generally to the heritage of the Pier Road area. The main issues have been summarised as follows:

- The submission from the Pier Road residents welcomes the proposal in the LAP for an ACA along Pier Road. Their submission proposes, however, that a village square be created at Poll Mor on field adjacent to foreshore along Pier Road in Village Core area. This is a historic rear harbour area between the two bridges on the stream and the land is by and large unsuitable for large scale development. Object to proposal for terrace development in this field and propose instead that the building line be setback to frame a proper village square to provide a focal point at the pier and provide a view of the existing Pier Road terrace. Sketch attached to submission showing proposals.
- The submission from Coiste Céibhe Bhearna notes that the heritage of the harbour

area should be preserved, including the 2 stone bridges crossing Truskey Stream and the dry harbour known as Poll Mor.

- The submission from Sean Beatty highlights the historical importance of Poll Mor, a bog hole in the River Field, which forms part of the fishing heritage of Bearna and which should be restored as part of the village history.

Response:

The LAP policy in relation to the Pier Road ACA is as follows:

Policy 2.6.2D – Architectural Conservation Area

It is the policy of the Council to protect, conserve and enhance the essential character of the Pier Road Architectural Conservation Area (ACA), identified in TABLE 2.6.2C, MAP 2.6.2A and MAP 2.6.2B, through the control of the design, location and layout of new properties or the alteration or extension of existing ones.

The response received from the Conservation Officer on this issue notes as follows:

The proposal for an Architectural Conservation Area as set out in page 41 of the Draft LAP is welcomed, and the information provided in the form of descriptions and photographs of the structures illustrate the quality of the vernacular structures which the designation would seek to protect and enhance. It should be noted that this area contains Protected Structures (RPS 886, Barna Pier/Rinn na Mara) and a Recorded Monument (RMP GA093-020 – graveyard) and should the boundaries of the proposed ACA be amended it may cover a greater number of Protected Structures or Recorded Monuments which must be taken into consideration.

This issue was raised by a number of submissions, all of which welcomed the idea of an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) which will maintain the unique character of Barna village, whilst still providing a suitable framework for development within the village to maintain viability. An assessment of the architectural character of the village and its building stock from which policies for their maintenance and enhancement are essential. It may be noted that some submissions suggested that the height of future development be restricted from 1- 3.5 storeys in height to maintain the visual amenity of the village and it's rural ambience.

A number of submissions highlighted the dry harbour area known as "An Poll Mór" in the "River Field", on the Pier Road close to the pier. A dry harbour would have been essential to the use and viability of the harbour in the past; it could have provided a haven for carrying out repairs for example. On foot of this information it is essential, therefore, to view the Pier and the Poll Mór not as two individual entities but related facets of a cohesive whole. Any decision taken in relation to one element should not negatively impact on the character, fabric or appreciation of the other. Coiste Céibhe Bhearna also pointed out that there were two historic bridges here over the Truskey Stream. Although An Poll Mór/ River Field were not mentioned specifically, one of the bridges over the Truskey Stream was highlighted in the report. These features should form part of an architectural assessment of the village and form part of the proposed Architectural Conservation Area.

There was also a suggestion by the residents of the Pier Road that future development in this area be designed and set back forming a village square which would compliment the use of the nearby pier and maintain the views along the Pier Road of the historic terraces there and to the Pier and the Bay beyond. On foot of these submissions it is recommended that the Poll Mór area of the Pier Road be looked at in greater detail and the proposal for a public space here be investigated. The historic Pier Road terrace and Barna Pier form an intrinsic part of the character of Barna village and their setting should be carefully considered in any future development of this area.

Submission 63 by Rachel Crawford picked up on the "character of Barna as a small Gaeltacht fishing village" and felt that it needed to be re-established through centring development on Pier Road, harbour and the beach. The maintenance of the character of Barna is essential, however the suitability of increased development on Pier Road and the beach must be assessed thoroughly, possibly as part of an assessment for the proposed Architectural Conservation Area.

The ACA is important to ensure that the character of this area is retained as it is one of the few remaining historical parts of the village centre. The proposal put forward by the local residents is considered to have significant merit given the following:

- It will create a new focal point at a strategic public access point to the seashore, which is at the end of Pier Road, the entrance to the pier and at the entrance to the proposed coastal amenity park and seaside promenade.
- It will provide an asset and focal point for new development along the foreshore/coastal park.
- It will provide visual relief from the relatively narrow Pier Road with terrace developments and narrow building setbacks and will open up vistas along the Pier Road out over Galway Bay.
- It will provide an appropriate setting for the existing terrace development along Pier Road, which is the main feature of the ACA proposed along Pier Road and will allow for greater appreciation of this important element of the built heritage of the village.

It should be borne in mind, however, that this portion of land is not owned by the local residents and that the landowner has indicated his intention to develop these lands. Nonetheless, the Draft LAP encourages the development of group proposals for landowner's lands and the current site should be considered together with the larger area of land east of the pier. This would enable the objective of providing a Village Square on the subject site to be achieved while at the same time allowing for high value development on other portions of the consolidated landholding which would ensure that the landowner gets an adequate return on his lands as part of a group proposal/development.

The importance of the Poll Mor field and associated stone bridges is acknowledged and it is suggested that this be recognised and a reference included under Table 2.6.2D relating to the ACA. It will also be necessary to amend the information in the Lap relating to Bearna Pier as this has now been included on the Record of Protected Structures.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a reference be included in Table 2.6.2D to the Poll Mor field, stone bridges and fishing heritage of the area, including a brief written description and photo. The suggested wording for this would be as follows (main change highlighted in bold):

10B – Adjacent Fields

*Adjacent fields along the eastern edge of Pier Road in Freeport Townland. **The heritage of the Poll Mor field, stone bridges and inlet area should be protected and maintained but there may also be opportunities for infill development.** This should be in keeping with the character of the ACA in terms of appropriate uses, building forms, heights, materials, etc.*

It is recommended that the LAP be amended where necessary to include Bearna Pier as an existing Protected Structure (currently proposed in the LAP). This will affect Map 2.6.2A Table 2.6.2A and Table 2.6.2B, amongst others.

On the proposal of Cllr Joyce and seconded by Comh Ní Fhartharta it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8.6 Sub-Issue 8E – Ecological Network and Habitats

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown

Summary:

The above submission notes that the Draft LAP proposes an EcoNet based on limited information obtained prior to drafting the LAP. GCC should carry out a habitat survey on lands north of R336 and a study of existing stone walls and small rights of way and access routes.

Response:

The EcoNet has been identified on the basis of best practice approaches to biodiversity and nature conservation in Ireland and Europe. The identification of areas is based on the classification used in the national study and has been supplemented by the work undertaken as part of the coastal habitat study. It is acknowledged that additional work could be undertaken to further inform the EcoNet but given the shortage of time and resources, this has not been possible. It should be noted, however, that the provisions in the LAP provide for the protection of the main elements of an EcoNet and that this will be supplemented by additional detailed assessments required as part of all significant planning applications in the area.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report

2.8.7 Sub-Issue 8F – Sea Angling Zone/Marine Fish Life

Submitted By:

- No. 26 – Kevin Rodgers (WRFB)

Summary:

The WRFB submission notes that the Galway Bay SAC supports a variety of marine fish life and the Board would support the creation of a specific zone for sea angling, which could be done by way of groynes (similar to Salthill) extending seawards which would help prevent coastal erosion and would facilitate the establishment of sandy zones. The foreshore is considered too rocky.

Response:

The relevant objectives in the LAP are as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an

additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

It is considered that the LAP should angling activities and it is accordingly suggested that the wording of objective CF7 be amended to reflect this and other important facilities, such as beaches.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the wording of Objective CF7 be revised as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include the retention and enhancement of existing sandy beaches, the establishment of new beach areas as appropriate, the establishment of appropriate areas and facilities for angling and the development of clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr M Connolly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8.8 Sub-Issue 8G – Architectural/Built Heritage

Submitted By:

- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The main issues raised by the above submissions with regard to architectural/built heritage are as follows:

- BH7 (Architectural Heritage) in Draft LAP is a bit vague and should include references to roof type, windows, finish and height of buildings to strengthen this proposal.
- Draft LAP is incorrect in its designation of the old RIC barracks.

Response:

Objective BH7 is as follows:

BH7 – New Works

Encourage that any new works contribute positively to the architectural and historic character of the area, its present and future life.

The response received from the Conservation Officer on this sub-issue is as follows:

Submitted By:

- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Lary Margaret Moran & Aidan Walsh

Submission 48 by Pobal Bhearna supported the reference to the Built Heritage in the Draft LAP, but felt it should have been more specific. To address this, a broader architectural inventory and assessment should be undertaken of the proposed Architectural Conservation Area, as set out by DoEHLG Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines. From this more accurate policies in relation to the maintenance and protection of the architectural heritage of Barna may be devised and adopted. However, the study undertaken for the Draft LAP did highlight the quantity, quality and diversity of many older buildings in Barna, including the pier and Lynch Memorial (Protected Structures) and buildings of social and cultural importance such as the former RIC barracks and the handball alley.

Submission 53, Coiste Pobal Bhearna felt that the Draft LAP is incorrect in its designation of the old RIC barracks. However, no further comment appears as to how the designation is incorrect. This could be from one of three perspectives:

- (1) it is not a former barracks, however it's design and detailing are consistent with RIC barracks in Galway and South Connamara area from this time*
- (2) It should be considered as a building of regional significance and therefore worthy of inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures*
- (3) It is not of any significance.*

It has been noted in the Draft LAP as a building of particular local significance due to its historic social association with the village and its hinterland; it is also of architectural significance as it externally retains its historic design, fenestration arrangement and features including a slate roof. There may be cause to consider it for inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures on foot of these considerations, however this will have to be investigated further at a future time.

It is acknowledged that Objective BH17 could benefit from greater clarity and detail and it is suggested that this be qualified accordingly. As the Conservation Officer has suggested, however, further more detailed consideration may need to be given to the ACA and guidelines for new works and this would need to be dealt with under the process to formally adopt the ACA.

The old RIC barracks has been proposed as a Structure of Local Interest in the Bhearna LAP. It is not clear from the submission what particular element of this proposal is incorrect. The identification of the police barracks has been based on the available records and a recognition of the built heritage of this structure and its social significance in the village.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Objective NH7 be amended as follows:

BH7 – New Works

Encourage that any new works contribute positively to the architectural and historic character of the area, its present and future life. New works should be in keeping with the roof type, windows, finishes and height of existing buildings, as appropriate.

No change recommended with regard to the old RIC barracks.

On the proposal of Cllr. Kyne and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8.9 Sub-Issue 8H – Landscape Character and Views/Scenic Qualities

Submitted By:

- No. 52 – Maire Breathnach, Larry, Margaret, Michael & Brid Walsh

- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The above submissions state that the concept in Objective NH32 is 30 years out of date in Bearnna and should be deleted

Response:

Objective NH32 is as follows:

Objective NH32 – Scenic Qualities

Consider the recommendation in the Landscape and Landscape Character Assessment for County Galway that the scenic qualities of the coastal zone (particularly 50m either side of the coastal road) from Galway Bay to the mouth of Killary Harbour be protected, possibly through its designation as an Area of Special Amenity or as a Landscape Conservation in accordance with the PDA 2000.

It is acknowledged that there are significant portions along the R336 within the Bearnna Plan Area where development has taken place that has altered the scenic qualities of this coastal road. Nonetheless, there are stretches of the R336 that retain their scenic qualities and which provide panoramic views over Galway Bay and beyond that form a highly important part of the visual amenity of Bearnna. These areas could be considered for inclusion under Objective NH32 but this would be subject to more detailed consideration following the adoption of the LAP.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8.10 Sub-Issue 8I – Fishing Village Heritage

Submitted By:

- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford

Summary:

There is no concrete evidence whatsoever to support reference to fishing village heritage in Bearnna; rather Bearnna was predominantly a village of small farmers and market gardeners. Propose that Objective CH4 be amended/corrected to address this.

Response:

Objective CH4 states as follows:

CH4 – Fishing and Maritime Heritage

Ensure that the fishing and maritime heritage of the village is protected and that new developments respect and enhance the relationship of the village to the sea. In particular:

- *Preserve the use of Bearnna Pier as a fishing and boating facility in the village.*
- *Investigate the feasibility of developing a local jetty or marina in the vicinity of Bearnna Pier to enhance the fishing and maritime role of the village and contribute to the reintegration of the village with Galway Bay.*

There is substantial evidence of fishing heritage in Bearnna. According to the 1812 Census, there were 516 inhabitants in Bearnna comprising 54 families, 22 of whom were involved in

agriculture and the remainder in fishing and other labouring work. The pier has been part of the village since it was first constructed in 1799 and was a safe haven for boats. The pier was used for bringing turf to Galway and was the centre of social activity in the village. The Ordinance Survey Map of 1836 also shows the fisherman's cottages along the coastline.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr Kyne and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.8.11 Sub-Issue 8J – Gaeltacht Status/Irish Language

Submitted By:

- No. 24 – Sonya Nic Lochlain (Udaras na Gaeltachta)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 85 – Eileen & Joseph Hernon

Summary:

The main issues raised in relation the Gaeltacht status of Bearna and the protection of the Irish language are as follows:

- Gaeltacht status of Bearna should be maintained and improved, Irish language should be promoted, an Irish language teaching centre should be set up (perhaps opposite Freeport House) and a heritage centre incorporating a craft shop should be considered.
- A submission from a landowner raises a concern that the coastal development setback will prevent the landowner's family, who are native Irish speakers, from settling in their own community.

The submission from Udaras na Gaeltachta raises the following points:

- Submission observes the remarkable measure GCC has undertaken in relation to giving recognition to the Gaeltacht in the LAP. Also acknowledge contribution of the GCDP 2003-2009.
- Irish has land use implications that should be taken into account in the LAP.
- The Gaeltacht is a valuable State asset and the legislation sets out how Udaras na Gaeltachta and the Planning Authority should seek to protect the Irish language.
- There are numerous forces at work that erode Irish as a community language, including the media, new social networks, lack of social infrastructure, people from outside buying and building houses, etc.
- Irish is spoken by 64% of the population over 3 years of age according to the 2006 Census, more than 15 companies were receiving help from Udaras with a good number of Irish speakers employed, Barna Playschool is operating through Irish and the national school is recognised as a Gaeltacht school.
- Language is frail and needs reinforcement in Bearna. Development pressures are greatest on City edges and is eroding community language. Housing estates have a negative language influence on communities where Irish is already under pressure, more so than single houses.
- Economic and social infrastructure will not be able to keep up with the pressure or demand for development if provisions in the GCDP 2003-2009 are applied and recent growth trends continue. There is a shortfall in existing facilities and this should be upgraded for existing residents before additional housing is developed.
- Given the pressures, every protection should be given to Irish in the Gaeltacht and it is considered that the protective provisions for Irish in the legislation would be

breached unless a policy would be applied for the good of Irish.

- Recognition must be given to Irish in all planning and development strategies which relate to the Bearna area.
- Close co-operation must exist between all practitioners involved to ensure that the correct development is made that will develop the area and promote Bearna and Irish instead of them both being restrained by allowing huge housing developments.

Response:

The LAP provides the following policy and objectives with regard to the Gaeltacht status of Bearna and the protection of the Irish language:

POLICY 2.6.1B | An Gaeltacht

It is the policy of the Council to have regard to the location of Bearna within the Gaeltacht, to continue to safeguard and promote the status of the Irish language in Bearna and its contribution to the linguistic heritage of An Gaeltacht, to implement an effective system through which the various aspects of the Gaeltacht ethos can be assessed and protected as part of the planning process, and to ensure that new developments respect, complement and contribute to the character of the area and to the Irish language.

CH7 | Appropriate Developments

Support the following types of development in appropriate locations in Bearna, in accordance with Policy 205 of the *GCDP 2003-2009* and subject to other Development Plan requirements and site circumstances:

- Irish Language Teaching Resources.
- Recreational facilities through Irish.
- Houses for native speakers.
- Houses for native speakers by voluntary organisations.
- Low cost houses for young Irish speaking couples.
- Community centres that support Irish.
- Educational facilities, such as third level facilities.
- Tourism ventures that are language centred.
- Gaeltacht offices for the purpose of providing services through Irish for the Gaeltacht community.
- Irish speaking families who wish to settle in Gaeltacht areas.
- Businesses that are language centred, such as translation/communication services.

CH8 | Spoken Language

Promote the use of Irish as a spoken language in the village.

CH9 | Development Impacts

Control residential, commercial and industrial developments that may have a negative impact on the Irish language.

CH10 | Naming of Developments

Ensure that the naming of developments shall be in Irish only and reflect the character of the area. Estate names must be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development, in accordance with Policy 210 of the *GCDP 2003-2009*.

CH11 | Language Impact Statements

Require a Language Impact Statement (LIS) with applications for two or more houses or where an applicant applied for more than one house in an area, in accordance with Section 10.9 and Policy 209 of the *GCDP 2003-2009*. A LIS will also be required for all large commercial and mixed use applications for development in the area or those that may have a potential impact on the Irish language in Bearna.

CH12 | Community and Economic Facilities

Encourage the development of educational, recreational, tourism and business facilities that operate through the medium of the Irish language. Promote the commercial advantage for local businesses/tourism enterprises to develop Bearna with a Gaeltacht/fishing village theme.

CH13 | Consultation and Co-operation

Support *Udarás na Gaeltachta* in fulfilling its role as a development agency, in accordance with Policy 208 of the *GCDP 2003-2009*. Actively co-operate with *Udarás na Gaeltachta* and the local community in the provision of facilities for *naionraí* and *naionlanne* (Gaelic Nurseries, playschools and crèches).

CH14 | Contractors

Ensure that all contractors employed by GCC in Bearna will have regard to the culture in which they work, in accordance with Objective 73 of the *GCDP 2003-2009*.

CH15 | Signage

Signage to be in Irish only with internationally recognised symbols, in accordance with Policy 206 of the *GCDP 2003-2009*.

The LAP has considered the provisions of the *GCDP 2003-2009* in respect of the Gaeltacht and has applied these to the Bearna area. The LAP is subservient to the County Plan and must be consistent with the policies and objectives in the County Plan with respect to the Gaeltacht. The LAP provides a range of objectives intended to recognise the Gaeltacht status of Bearna and to protect the Irish language.

The LAP also provides for the delivery of sites for community facilities and amenities and promotes the delivery of adequate services and infrastructure to support the existing and future residents in the Bearna area. It must also implement the policies in the County Plan with respect to growth rates and the house construction allocation in the *GCDP 2003-2009*.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr Walsh and seconded by Comh O'Tuairis it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9 Issue 9 – Roads and Transportation

2.9.1 Issue 9 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 1 – Mary Mac Oireadraig
- No. 5 – Michael & Julie Conneely
- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 9 – Tom Herson
- No. 13 – Aileen Harte (NRA)
- No. 14 – Seán Murray

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 40 – Michael, Barry & Shane Heskin
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 66 – Mr. Sean Boland
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy
- No. 81 – Adriano Cavalleri
- No. 95 – Marcus O'Sullivan
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

A total of 25 submissions raise concerns regarding roads and transportation in Bearna. The majority of these relate to the proposed Inner Relief Road/New Village Street.

2.9.2 Sub-Issue 9A – Proposed Inner Relief Road/New Village Street

Submitted By:

- No. 1 – Mary Mac Oireadraig
- No. 5 – Michael & Julie Conneely
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 23 – Evelyn Hernon Moylan
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 40 – Michael, Barry & Shane Heskin
- No. 42 – Willie Leahy
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 66 – Mr. Sean Boland
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy
- No. 81 – Adriano Cavalleri
- No. 95 – Marcus O'Sullivan
- No. 101 – Alan Giblin
- No. 102 – Tina Corcoran

Summary:

A significant number of submissions are in favour of the new Village Street proposed in the LAP but the majority of submissions object to the the development of an Inner Relief Road as proposed under the Part 8 applicaiton and approval for the road. The main concerns raised are as follows:

- The proposed closure of the east and west link roads (Aille and Avough/Forramoyle East) will result in the vast majority of the existing houses north of that road being outside of sustainable walking distance from the village services and amenities. At the same time the journey times and distances for

vehicular traffic to the commercial centre will be increased.

- The LAP is incorrect in stating that: "This street proposal was adopted by the elected members of GCC on 26th September 2006 as part of a Part 8 Planning Application". The Part 8 Application was passed on 23rd October 2006 and was not for a street but for an Inner Relief Road (also described in the Part 8 Application as a Bypass).
- The proposed Relief Road is not capable of handling all local traffic that is village centre bound as well as non local Bearna to Moycullen traffic.
- Proposed Relief Road/Village Street sub-divides the Conneely's property, is likely to interfere with the amenity of the rear of the property and would not allow for ready access to the north or south due to proposed road level.
- It should be an aspiration to have the proposed Relief Road/Street and its approach road traffic calmed.
- Describing the road as a street creates confusion and reflects badly on the professionalism of the Council Executive. It is clear that the Council Executive were of the view that a Part 8 Application would be passed irrespective of any submissions from the public.
- The LAP states that the street will have appropriate junctions while remaining silent on the proposal to close two existing junctions.
- The LAP does not make it clear if any EIS was done for the Inner Relief Road or New Village Street and the absence of an EIS the route should not progress. It would not be acceptable that the LAP be adopted on the promise of a future study.
- The new road has no provision for pedestrian crossings and will, in its present design, create a high risk to pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular traffic.
- Several landowners along the route of the new road object to the proposed routing of due to the impact on their property, the restriction on access and difficulties in obtaining planning permission.
- Draft LAP refers to New Village Road in centre of Bearna village but this should not become the name of the new road as it would cause postal havoc with the existence of the townland of New Village.
- GCOB is ultimate answer to traffic congestion on coast road and monies would be better spent on the northern bypass in long term as opposed to proposed village bypass. GCOB needs to be developed to re-route traffic to Conamara away from Bearna. Local bypass road will not solve traffic problems in Bearna and will mainly open up lands for development.
- New Village Street should be reassessed as it is not consistent with what LAP is trying to achieve and appears to be founded on an engineering approach rather than good urban design.
- Pobal Bhearna submission strongly supports proposals for Main Village Street and New Village Street. Inclusion of New Village Street now allows GCC to naturally move Village Core northwards and this should in turn facilitate keeping coastal zone at 50m. Do not believe that GCC's proposals for an Inner Relief Road are compatible with the planned New Village Street. Agree that school should be moved to new street but state that adequate access, safety and pedestrian crossings should be provided.
- New development should not penalise quality of life of the "old residents" of Bearna, including ongoing access to the village with the existing road.
- Replace cul-de-sac in Truskey East/Inner Relief Road with a roundabout to prevent traffic congestion when turning right onto Truskey Road (from Galway direction) and to naturally reduce traffic speed.

One of the submissions received is in agreement with proposed New Village Street to alleviate traffic problems, which will not be catered for by Galway City Outer Bypass (GCOB). Propose that new road have traffic calming measures, footpaths, essential

improvements to approach roads and that 50km/h speed limit be extended by 1km on all approach roads.

Response:

The response received from the Road Design Section is as follows:

- The road Part 8 decision always was for a street.
- The interference of the new road with amenity of existing residences is a compensation/arbitration issue.
- It is agreed it should be an aspiration to have the relief road/street and its approach road traffic calmed.
- Access points will be allowed for the new road.
- The objections and concerns raised in relation to the new road and the Part 8 procedure undertaken are rejected.
- The Part 8 process has been completed and are proceeding to land acquisition.
- The provision of adequate access, safety and pedestrian crossing along the new road/street is an issue for a traffic management plan and not for a LAP.

The proposals in the LAP for a new Village Street have been informed by the following:

- The public consultation input received, including mainly an objection to a high speed village bypass that would split the village and strong support for the creation of a new village street.
- The fact that the new road has already been approved under a separate Part 8 procedure by the elected members.
- The strong advocacy of the road as proposed in the Part 8 by the Road Design Section as the optimum proposal for dealing safely with the large volume of traffic in Bearna.
- The agreement in principle of the Road Design Section to the creation of a new village street with appropriate junctions, streetscapes, pedestrian crossings, etc.

The LAP has accordingly had to take on board the decision of the elected members and the views of the Road Design Section in terms of the routing and overall design of the road. The LAP does, however, strongly support the creation of a village street and it is considered that this can ultimately be achieved and this has been agreed in principle by the Road Design Section. The LAP has put forward proposals for how this street could be developed with an active streetscape, appropriate junctions, pedestrian crossings, cycle lanes, etc. The detailed design and construction of this road will need to be determined as land acquisition and design drawings progress. However, these will have to be developed in accordance with the overall framework provided by the LAP and the ultimate aim of creating a new street.

Additional work has been undertaken to show how parts of the street might be developed and it is suggested that the main drawings from this recent study be inserted into the Development Framework and Roads sections of the LAP. This study has been attached for your information.

The details of the of the Part 8 approval have been confirmed and the correct date of approval is the 23rd October 2006 and this was for an Inner Relief Road and the relevant text in the LAP should be amended accordingly.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the main design drawings prepared for parts of the new street be inserted into the Roads and Development Framework sections of the LAP to show how the new village street might develop over time (see attached report).

It is recommended that the paragraph on Page 61 be amended as follows:

A new inner road has been planned for Bearna for many years and a section of this new route was recently constructed as part of a major housing development in the village centre. This new road proposal was adopted by the elected members of GCC on 23rd October 2006 as part of a Part 8 Planning Application. Further development of this route would assist in improving the quality of environment in the centre of the village and in improving traffic safety, circulation and management. It would also provide an opportunity to create a new street in the village with high quality residential, community and associated development.

It is further recommended that the Planning Section and Road Design Section work together on the design of the new street to ensure that it meets roads and traffic safety requirements whilst still achieving the high quality village street proposed in the LAP. This would need to be undertaken on an ongoing basis during and after the plan adoption process.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.3 Sub-Issue 9B – Proposed Galway City Outer Bypass

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Heron
- No. 13 – Aileen Harte (NRA)
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy
- No. 95 – Marcus O'Sullivan

Summary:

A number of submissions raise issues relating to the proposed Galway City Outer Bypass (GCOB).

- The NRA submission supports the concentration of development in established urban areas and designated development centres as advocated by LAP. In interests of this approach and the safety, operational efficiency and national investment in national roads infrastructure, it is critical that a corridor for GCOB be protected as an objective. Any increase in cost of the proposed or alternative scheme that results from rezoning or adoption of development objections would not be eligible for funding by the NRA.
- A number of submissions support the GCOB as the ultimate answer to traffic congestion in Bearna and along the R336 coast road. GCOB needs to be developed to re-route traffic to Conamara away from Bearna.
- The LAP should make provision for a future rail link and to consider a corridor for a rail link, perhaps along the route of the GCOB.
- A submission proposes that land be set aside for a light industry park close to the new GCOB to avoid extra traffic generation through the village.
- Need to provide proper linkages across the GCOB to the Moycullen Bogs pNHA from the local roads. Attached map highlights need for linkage along Paintbox/Avough Road.

Response:

The LAP supports the development of the GCOB under Objective RT1 as follows:

Objective RT1 – Road Network Hierarchy

Support the development of an adequate road hierarchy in Bearna that provides a range of movement routes with road designs, safety standards, levels of access and adjacent development appropriate to the role of the route in the hierarchy. This will be comprised of the following existing and proposed routes:

1. *Proposed GCOB National Route – Proposed national route with limited access and high speed standard for Galway City and County.*
2. *Proposed Conamara Road – Proposed regional/national route providing an alternative to the congested R336 regional route.*
3. *R336 Regional Route – Existing R336 regional route providing the main street in Bearna village and the main road linkage along the coast.*
4. *Moycullen Road – Primary north-south local road providing a linkage between Bearna village and Moycullen.*
5. *North-South Roads – Other north-south roads linking the coastal parts of Bearna to the hinterland, including Aille Road, Avough/Paintbox Road and Forramoyle Road.*
6. *Third Class Local Roads – Local roads that generally provide the main local through routes in the Plan Area.*
7. *Fourth Class Roads – Local roads that are generally lower order local roads that are shorter or cul-de-sac routes.*
8. *Coastal Access Roads – Coastal access roads that connect from the R336 to the coastal lands, including Pier Road, Mag's Boreen and Lacklea Boreen.*
9. *Boreens, Laneways and Tracks – Lower order routes across the Plan Area that have potential as pedestrian/cycling linkages and local access.*
10. *Local Access Roads – Local access roads generally located within developments, including internal routes in housing estates.*

The majority of the western portion of the GCOB falls outside of the Bearna Plan Area and there is only a small portion that traverses the western boundary of the LAP. Nonetheless, it is suggested that the LAP would benefit from an objective dealing specifically with the GCOB and addressing the need to reserve a route for this route, to provide adequate junctions and linkages across the GCOB and to provide guidance on adjacent land uses.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the LAP would benefit from an objective dealing specifically with the GCOB and addressing the need to reserve a route for this route, to provide adequate junctions and linkages across the GCOB and to provide guidance on adjacent land uses. This should be inserted under Policy 2.7.2A as follows:

Objective RT2 – Galway City Outer Bypass

Support the development of the GCOB as a means of improving the strategic road network and reducing traffic volumes and congestion in Bearna. This should be guided by the following:

- *An adequate corridor to be reserved for the future development of the GCOB and associated link roads.*
- *Provision to be made for adequate junctions between the existing regional and local road network in Bearna with the GCOB, as appropriate.*
- *Provision to be made for safe linkages across the GCOB to ensure that the Bearna Plan Area can be adequately connected to surrounding areas and amenities. This would primarily be along existing local roads and the greenway linkages identified in the LAP, through the*

provision of underpasses, overpasses or other junctions as appropriate.

- *The type and location of major new developments in Bearna to consider the protection of the safety and operational efficiency of the GCOB.*
- *Consideration to be given to the provision of a park and ride facility at an appropriate point along or accessible to the GCOB to serve Bearna and the Conamara region providing access to Galway City.*

On the proposal of Comh Ni Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr. M. Connolly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.4 Sub-Issue 9C – Access Points and Pier Road

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 9 – Tom Hernon

Summary:

The main issues raised in relation to access points have been summarised as follows:

- The submission from the Pier Road residents raise concerns regarding the impact of new development on the coastal lands in the Village Core on Pier Road and state that vehicular access to Pier Road should be kept at its current level or as near as possible and that the main access route should not be from the R336 at the village crossroads but at 2 points further along the R336 where there is currently no development (as shown on attached maps).
- A submission regarding lands in the northwest corner of the Bearna Plan Area requesting that some access points be reserved to service a block of lands, mainly located in Forramoyle East Townland (as shown on attached map).

Response:

The LAP objective for access points is as follows:

RT5 – Access Points

Reserve access points to development lands in the village from public roads to ensure that lands are not cut-off and that their development potential can be realised. This is particularly important in the Village Core and Inner Village areas where development will be concentrated and where the provision of adequate access is paramount.

MAP 2.7.2 in the LAP shows the access points that should be reserved in the central portions of the village. This includes a new access point from the R336 to the coastal lands in the Village Core to provide adequate access as an alternative to the existing Pier Road and Mag's Boreen. This is considered necessary given the limited capacity of Pier Road and Mag's Boreen to handle additional traffic and the need to provide a high level of access to the strategic block of lands in the Village Core. It is considered that this will ensure that the traffic levels in Pier Road and Mag's Boreen will not be overloaded and adequate access will be provided. The details of this access and whether it would, for example, have a separate entrance and exit, would need to be determined at detailed design stage.

The access points are shown for the central parts of the village where the aim is to consolidate development and to provide a high level of access and permeability. It is not considered appropriate to indicate access points in the peripheral areas around the central areas as development is generally restricted to amenity, agricultural and local housing need related developments in these outlying areas. Proposals for single houses or clustered developments based on local housing need will be considered on their merits in these areas in accordance with the provision of the LAP and the GCDP 2003-2009.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr.S. Walsh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.6 Sub-Issue 9D – Silver Strand Road Improvements

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon

Summary:

The submission states that the LAP should provide for widening of Silver Strand Road from R336 and adequate parking in County area adjacent to Silver Strand to support water-related facilities mentioned on Page 31 of Draft Plan.

Response:

The relevant LAP objective is as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

The LAP therefore considers the potential widening of the access road to serve an enhanced beach facility. This will, however, require further investigation to determine the potential impacts on this high amenity area and to determine the optimum solution for enhancing the existing facility. GCC will also need to consult with Galway City Council in this regard to arrive at the optimum solution.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr M.Connolly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.6 Sub-Issue 9E – Village Streets

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues in relation to new streets in Bearnna and these have been summarised as follows:

- An amalgamated drawing should be prepared for Figure 3.1.2, 3.1.3 and 3.2.2 showing proposals for future new streets.
- The Pobal Bhearna submission strongly support proposals for Main Village Street

and New Village Street. Inclusion of New Village Street now allows GCC to naturally move VC northwards and this should in turn facilitate keeping coastal zone at 50m. Do not believe that GCC's proposals for an Inner Relief Road are compatible with the planned New Village Street.

- The main village street (R336) should not be considered a Restricted Route within the village boundary.

Response:

The issues raised in relation to the new Village Street have been dealt with under Sub-Issue 9A above.

The issue raised in relation to an amalgamated drawing has been addressed through the recent design study undertaken to provide additional guidance on the coastal lands and new street. Relevant drawings from this study should be inserted into the Development Framework and Roads sections to show how the development of the streets might occur.

The response received from the Road Design Section in relation to the R336 being a restricted route agrees with this proposal on completion of the inner relief road. It should be noted that the status of this route is set out under the GCDP 2003-2009 and the LAP must be consistent with the County Plan.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the main drawings in the recent design study undertaken be inserted into the Roads and Development Framework sections of the LAP to provide greater clarity and guidance for new development along the village streets.

No change recommended in relation the R336 status.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairis and seconded by Cllr M. Connolly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.7 Sub-Issue 9G – Traffic and Parking

Submitted By:

- No. 7 – Des Fitzgerald & Others (Pier Road Residents)
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues regarding the provision of adequate car parking within the village and particularly the proposal in the LAP to consider underground parking. The issues raised include the following:

- The underground parking proposed in the LAP is not feasible at the coast due to risk of flooding and water seepage and parking will need to be provided at ground level for high density development and visitors, tourists and shoppers to the area.
- Proposal for underground parking in the Village Centre area in Draft LAP to reduce building height and scale is a commendable goal but significant consequences at construction and demolition stage due to hard rock, need for blasting/rockbreaking and impact on amenity of residents. GCC should require an assessment of works required and impose conditions limiting hours of operation.
- Underground car parks should not be allowed in developments in Village Core area as terrain is unsuitable for deep excavation (SEA indicates that a shallow

water table is present in Bearna area).

- Establishment of a Public Car Park should be incorporated as a necessary amenity within Village Core area.

Response:

The relevant objective and guidelines in the LAP is as follows:

RT6 – Parking Provision (Development Strategy Section)

Provide adequate parking with developments in accordance with the standards in SECTION 4 of the Plan. Promote the use of underground and semi-basement car parking in the Village Core and in other locations wherever appropriate and practicable. This will help to:

- Reduce the surface area covered by parking and associated visual impacts.
- Increase the development potential of sites whilst retaining an appropriate building height, footprint and form.
- Improving visual amenity in areas with high value and development potential.

Where it can be shown that this type of parking is not feasible and/or desirable, then parking should generally be located behind buildings so that they can be screened from the street and allow for active building/street interfaces.

Road Standards (Development Management Section)

Where there is a difficulty in providing surface car parking spaces or where it is considered not to be in the interest of village design principles, underground parking will be required. This is of particularly relevance in the Village Core. Where this is unfeasible or unsuitable for planning reasons, the Planning Authority shall require the developer to make a financial contribution towards the provision of car parking facilities under the provisions of the Development Contribution Scheme. This situation will apply in particular to village centre infill or redevelopment projects. Multi-storey car park proposals will not normally be permitted but proposals for basement and semi-basement parking will be facilitated where appropriate.

Underground or semi-basement parking can make a significant contribution to increasing densities, lowering building heights, ensuring a safer and more attractive public realm and providing for improved pedestrian movement and amenity. This option should therefore be considered for significant developments in the Village Core and Inner Village where appropriate and feasible. The ultimate design and the extent of undergrounding or the use of semi-basement parking would need to be determined at design stage. It should also be noted that underground parking has been already been used in the village and in developments in Galway City.

It is acknowledged that there would be certain difficulties associated with underground or semi-basement parking including bedrock, impacts from rock removal, etc. It is accordingly considered that additional guidance be provided on this in the Development Management section of the LAP.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a new paragraph be inserted in Section 4.1.12 of the LAP as follows:

Where developments propose underground or semi-basement parking, they should consider: the existing ground conditions and any requirements for blasting or rockbreaking; the appropriate reuse, movement, treatment and/or disposal of any rock; and the amenity of existing residents and any nuisance control measures proposed, including the hours of operation of construction and demolition activities. An assessment of the above factors will

be required with all such developments, to be carried out by a suitably qualified person to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. Applications for other development proposals that propose significant rock blasting, rockbreaking or removal should also be accompanied by an assessment as outlined above.

On the proposal of Cllr Walsh and seconded by Cllr Reilly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.8 Sub-Issue 9H – Safety Audits and Impact Assessments

Submitted By:

- No. 13 – Aileen Harte (NRA)

Summary:

The NRA submission recommends that a development management objective be included that significant development proposals be accompanied by road safety audits and transport and traffic assessments, which would include cumulative impact of developments on the road network.

Response:

Section 4.1.12 of the Development Management section of the LAP states as follows:

The Noise and Transportation Directive measures will be taken into account for any new development within a 350m distance from the proposed Galway City Outer Bypass Road. Noise mitigation measures will be considered for all developments. All access points will be subject to Safety Audit and DMRB Safety requirements.

It is suggested that an additional statement be inserted to deal with road safety and traffic impacts for all large scale developments.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following sentence be added under Section 4.1.12 of the Development Management section of the LAP:

All significant development proposals shall be accompanied by road safety audits and transport and traffic assessments. These shall include a consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on the road network.

On the proposal of Comh O'Tuairisg and seconded by Cllr Reilly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.9 Sub-Issue 9I – Public Transport & Cycle Lanes/Greenway Linkages

Submitted By:

- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 70 – Michael Naughton Ltd
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues regarding cycle lanes and/or the greenway linkages proposed and the main issues have been summarised as follows:

- Fully endorse establishment of an amenity network/greenway linkages. LAP

should clearly indicate that cycle lanes should be in place along and adjacent to R336.

- Propose that Objective RT9 be amended to allow for extensive network of old boreens as inter-connecting greenway linkages in place of proposed streamside greenway linkages.
- Cycling on R336 is hazardous due to speeding traffic and narrow road, which needs to be widened to incorporate a cycle lane, particularly from village into Galway city.
- LAP deals with role of public transport and cycle ways in providing sustainable transport options for village. It is essential for sustainable development that LAP focus on providing key elements of public transport infrastructure in life of LAP such as for example an improved bus service or a cycle route.
- Establishment of a road network within village that will allow provision of a bus route/lane and bus stops, to provide for Village Core and residential areas. Make provision in plan for a future rail link and to consider a corridor for a rail link, perhaps in GCOB. Make provision for a QBC along with a bus stop and turning area in plan.
- A regular bus service is required from Bearna to city centre, which will decrease amount of traffic on road and provide a basic facility. At least 2 bus shelters are required for village.

Response:

The LAP objectives in relation to public transport and cycleways are as follows:

RT8 – Bus Services, Stops and Shelters

Promote an improved bus service in Bearna and investigate the potential to provide more frequent stops and bus shelters, particularly in the village centre along the R336 and new Village Street. The new Village Street will provide a potential loop for a bus service through Bearna.

RT11 – Cycle Route

Support the provision of a continuous cycle path along the new Village Street. This may require additional adjacent lands on the recently constructed portion of the route.

RT13 – Potential Future Public Transport

Support the provision of improved public transport measures in the future. Examples could include the following:

- ***Quality Bus Corridors*** – *The provision of Quality Bus Corridors could become feasible west of the City and provide an important service from Bearna into Galway City.*
- ***Park and Ride Facilities*** – *The provision of park and ride facilities west of Galway City would help to relieve traffic congestion and provide a useful service into the City.*
- ***Light Rail System*** – *The provision of a Light Rail System for Galway City and surrounds would become more desirable and feasible as the area grows and populations increase, which would provide a more efficient and cost-effective alternative to road-based private and public transport.*

Objective RT2 (R336 Main Street) also states that cycling facilities should be provided wherever practicable along this route.

The LAP therefore provides a number of objectives intended to improve public transport in Bearna, including bus services, pedestrian and cycling routes and potential future light rail-based services. This is an important part of the LAP in recognition of the volume of traffic and congestion in the village, the high degree of mobility of local residents, the location of the

majority of employment opportunities in Galway City and the need to improve public transport services for the local community.

The reponse received from the Road Design Section in relation to improved bus services notes that the new inner relief road will allow for a loop system within the village for a bus service.

The provision of a rail corridor along the GCOB is a strategic issue that would be more appropriately considered within the scope of the County Development Plan. It should also be noted that there is only a short section of the GCOB within the Bearna Plan Area.

There are considerable constraints to achieving a continuous cycling route along the R336 given the limited width of the R336 and the high volume of vehicular traffic. The LAP therefore takes a practical approach in this regard and supports the provision of improved cycling facilities along the R336 under Objective RT2 wherever practical. The LAP also proposed a seaside greenway linkage that should be designed to provide a safe walking and cycling route from Bearna to Silver Strand and to Galway City.

It is acknowledged that public transport improvements should be provided at an early stage to support the local community and developments in the area, such as improved bus transport and a cycle route. This would be a matter for implementation following the adoption of the LAP.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr S.Walsh and seconded by Cllr Reilly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.9.10 Sub-Issue 9J – Speed Limits

Submitted By:

- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The submission proposes that there be a policy stating that all roads in Bearna LAP area be subject to a 50km/h speed limit be added.

Response:

The reponse received from the Road Design Section on this sub-issue notes that the speed limits are the subject of speed limit bylaws and not the LAP. It would accordingly not be appropriate to address this matter under the LAP.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Cllr S.Walsh and seconded by Cllr M.Connolly it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.10 Issue 10 – Infrastructure and Services

2.10.1 Issue 10 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown

- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna
- No. 26 – Kevin Rodgers (WRFB)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 49 – Peter O’Fegan
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 88 – Tadhg O hlarnáin
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

A total of 20 submissions raise issues in relation to services and infrastructure in Bearnna. The vast majority of these submissions raise concerns regarding the wastewater disposal proposals in the LAP and the need for infrastructure to be provided to serve existing development.

2.10.2 Sub-Issue 10A – Bearnna Sewerage Scheme/ Temporary On-Site Wastewater Treatment

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 26 – Kevin Rodgers (WRFB)
- No. 29 – The Conneely Family
- No. 43 – Mssrs. Darcy, Molloy & Others
- No. 44 – Mr. Tom Cunningham & Mr. Jim Cunningham
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 51 – Daragh O’Tuirisg & Aine Feeney McTigue
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 63 – Rachel Crawford
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 88 – Tadhg O hlarnáin
- No. 89 – Caroline Gannon
- No. 90 – Jimmy Gannon
- No. 91 – Linda Duffy
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues in relation to the lack of public wastewater capacity to service existing and new developments in the Bearnna area and the provisions under the LAP for allowing temporary on-site wastewater treatment for new development. The majority object to the proposed provisions for allowing for interim on-site wastewater treatment. The main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- The GCC Bearna Sewerage Scheme is inadequate to deal with the existing developments in Bearna let alone additional developments that would be permitted under the LAP. The catchment of the scheme should be expanded to include all existing and new development in the central parts of the village.
- A number of submissions highlight the need for a new wastewater treatment system for Bearna or the provision of additional capacity to service existing residents and recent new developments.
- Propose that plans be immediately (within first year of LAP) brought forward to cater for sewage requirements of all existing and future developments within LAP boundary.
- A number of submissions state that the remaining capacity in the public wastewater system for Bearna should be allocated to existing residents in the interests of fairness and to reduce environmental impacts from existing systems.
- Proposal to use on-site wastewater treatment plants is unacceptable as village infrastructure is falling behind, watercourses already highly polluted and temporary treatment plants will increase not mitigate.
- It is not sustainable to continue to service a substantial amount of existing and projected population with on site wastewater treatment plants.
- Existing stream pollution and shortage of public wastewater is a major issue but LAP does not afford priority it should have. Interim on site treatment plants are totally inadequate and delivery of infrastructure is fundamental to achievement of LAP.
- Pobal Bhearna submission notes that CAAS Environmental Report reveals serious and disturbing levels of water pollution in Bearna area. This is an environmental problem, health risk and threat to designated SPA at Silver Strand and Rusheen Estuary. Given scale of problem, it is completely unacceptable that GCC should facilitate further developments in Bearna through temporary on site systems. This is contrary to EU legislation, will accelerate degradation of water environment and endanger human health. Best option is to restrict development until capacity of existing public wastewater system has been sufficiently increased to accommodate new developments. Serious concerns regarding proposed Public Gravity Drainage Sewerage Scheme for Bearna and location of proposed pumping station west of O'Grady's Seafood Restaurant within a few metres of foreshore. Strongly recommend that remaining 200PE of GCC's Mutton Island allocation (equivalent to about 70 new houses) is allocated to existing residents before any new developments are considered. This would help to undo some of pollution damage outlined in SEA report.
- Phase 1 of sewerage scheme only includes Village Core meaning that only major developers/developments are being catered for with little or no consideration being given to local residents outside Village Core area. Interim measures are not acceptable to deal with future developments and plan should provide for comprehensive wastewater collection system for entire plan area.
- Irresponsible to propose that new developments use temporary on site sewerage systems as interim measure until public wastewater capacity available, it is contrary to EU legislation, will accelerate degradation of water environment and a public connection may not be provided for many years. Lot of evidence to suggest that the current water problems in Bearna and Galway City are a direct result of temporary wastewater systems and poor environmental monitoring.
- New developments should not be allowed to use temporary on site sewerage systems as interim measure until public wastewater capacity available. Lot of evidence to suggest that the current water problems in Bearna and Galway City are a direct result of temporary wastewater systems and poor environmental monitoring.
- DoEHLG submission notes that absence of significant spare capacity for

wastewater is a concern and majority of households discharge to septic tanks. A cautious approach needs to be taken to proposed temporary private wastewater treatment systems as they can cause problems for GCC in future in regard to future maintenance and taking in charge.

- Potential future location of pumping station in designated Coastal Amenity Park should be considered in LAP.
- Several submissions note that the line of the proposed sewer traverses their lands and affects their ability to develop these lands.

Response:

The LAP recognises that the Bearna area faces a shortage of public wastewater capacity and an existing environmental pollution problem in the existing streams. The LAP has sought to deal with this issue through the support for additional public wastewater capacity to be provided in Bearna and through the allowance for interim on site treatments systems to high environmental standards to protect the water quality and environment in Bearna. The provision of additional public wastewater capacity will be dependent on more strategic decisions being taken by GCC, Galway City Council and the DoEHLG amongst others with regard to additional capacity at Mutton Island or an alternative wastewater system for the western area. This is therefore beyond the scope of the LAP.

The policies and objectives in the LAP in relation to wastewater disposal are as follows:

POLICY 2.8.2A | Wastewater Disposal

It is the policy of the Council to support the provision of increased public wastewater capacity to serve existing and future developments in Bearna. As an interim measure, developments may be serviced by on site wastewater treatment systems, subject to adequate environmental protection measures, site layouts, future connection to the public sewer and appropriate decommissioning and reinstatement of lands.

IS1 | Public Wastewater System

Support the provision of a gravity-flow public sewerage scheme in the village with adequate capacity to service the needs of the existing population and future growth of Bearna. This system will need to be installed as a matter of priority and additional capacity will need to be sought to service the full extent of existing and future development in the village.

IS2 | Pumping Station

Secure an appropriate site for the pumping station and support the sensitive siting and design of the system to minimise impacts on the coastal edge. Options that could be considered would include partial under grounding and/or landscaping of the structure, the treatment of the structure as a sculptural architectural element, or designing the installation to provide for other appropriate uses, e.g. a viewing platform, skateboarding area, etc.

IS3 | Public Sewer Priorities

The priority for connection to the public sewer and utilisation of the limited remaining capacity will be given to well-located infill projects that will make a positive contribution to the design quality, services, facilities and amenities in the village.

IS4 | New Private Wastewater Treatment Plants

Restrict the development of private wastewater treatment units to serve

new housing, commercial and mixed use developments and give preference in terms of connection to the public sewer to those new housing developments that deliver the greatest community benefit in the optimum location, particularly land for a new primary school, community centre, coastal amenity park, sports facilities and/or water-based facilities. Larger village centre sites may be considered for private treatment plants where it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- Environmental and amenity considerations are fully addressed.
- Substantial community gain is delivered as an integral part of the development or adequate agreements are put in place that this be delivered in other appropriate location/s.
- The private system can be removed, the site restored to its pre-development condition and the development connected to the public sewer.
- The land previously utilised for the system being made available for open space or as otherwise required by the Planning Authority.
- The design and layout of the development not being unduly compromised by the incorporation of an on-site system.

IS5 | New Private Wastewater Treatment Systems

In situations where private treatment systems or septic tanks are permitted, their design, installation and maintenance should be strictly in accordance with the relevant EPA wastewater treatment manuals. In addition, developments must aim to achieve a high standard of effluent treatment to ensure that they do not increase the pollution levels in surface waters, in accordance with applicable standards and as required by the Local Authority.

IS6 | Existing On-Site Systems

Encourage the routine inspection of existing septic tanks and effluent treatment systems to ensure that they are operating in accordance with appropriate environmental standards and, where necessary, to undertake any maintenance and/or upgrading works required to improve performance and reduce environmental impacts. Existing septic tanks, percolation areas and proprietary effluent treatment systems to be upgraded in the long term to improve performance, efficiency and reduce potential for environmental pollution or surface water and/or groundwater.

IS7 | Site Suitability Assessments

Detailed site suitability assessments to be carried out by a suitably qualified person for any proposed effluent treatment system in accordance with the EPA wastewater treatment manuals and submitted with planning applications to the requirements of GCC.

IS8 | Maintenance Contracts

All new developments, including one-off houses, infill projects and housing estates, that are not connected to the public sewer will be required to have a minimum 10 year maintenance contract from a suitable manufacturer/supplier for the effluent treatment system to ensure effective maintenance, desludging, etc. Details of same to be submitted as part of applications for planning permission. At least 1 year prior to the termination of this contract, the home owner will submit details of a further 10 year contract, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

IS9 | Water Framework Directive

Support the implementation of the *WFD 2000* by taking into account data produced, including the recommendations forthcoming from the Western River Basin District Project, and amend the LAP where appropriate to achieve the target of good water quality in all watercourses and waterbodies by 2015.

The LAP also provides additional guidance under the Development Management section, which has been informed by the SEA for Bearna, as follows:

- Developments must comply with the requirements of all applicable standards and guidelines, including the EPA Manuals.
- Planning applications must demonstrate that wastewater resulting from the granting of the application will be treated so that any discharges to soil or water will work towards compliance with the following standards, subject to the EPA's (2000) Wastewater Treatment Manuals Treatment Systems for Single Houses: less than or equal to 30µg of phosphorus per litre of wastewater discharge, and; less than or equal to 100 faecal coliforms per 100ml of wastewater discharge.
- Applicants must submit a site suitability report alongside the planning application which outlines the likely effects on water quality which will be caused as a result of use of the relevant single waste water treatment system on site. This report shall be carried out by a appropriately qualified person.
- Planning applications seeking to develop a total plot area of greater than one hectare and/or planning applications seeking to develop multiple units within the Village Consolidation Zone must demonstrate that a regular monitoring system will be set up, either through Galway County Council or otherwise, for the relevant new wastewater treatment systems in order to ensure that they are operating within the relevant standards.
- The applicant, if successful with the relevant application, must submit a copy of an installation certificate to Galway County Council stating that the treatment system was installed in line with the subject to the EPA's (2000) Wastewater Treatment Manuals Treatment Systems for Single Houses as well as a copy of a maintenance contract for a minimum of 10 years of maintenance, including desludging, for the waste water treatment system by appropriately certified person(s).
- If capacity in a public waste water treatment scheme is not made available to all development within the Plan Area in the long term then existing septic tanks, percolation areas and proprietary effluent systems shall to be upgraded in the long term in line with the conditions specified above and a monitoring system shall be set up to the same effect.
- Design calculations supporting the selection of a particular size and type of plant.
- Certification that septic tanks have been desludged in accordance with EPA guidelines.

It is considered that the applicaiton of environmental standards and the additional requirements outlined above will ensure that the local environment is protected and that development and infrastructure provision can progress in an orderly manner.

The LAP proposes under Objective IS3 that priority for connection to the public sewer and utilisation of the limited remaining capacity will be given to well-located infill projects that will make a positive contribution to the design quality, services, facilities and amenities in the village. It is acknowledged that existing residents in the catchment of the sewerage scheme should ultimately be provided with a public wastewater connection but the LAP proposes the above objective in order to facilitate a significant improvement in the village character and

amenities in the short term. Nonetheless, it is suggested that this objective be reworded to provide greater clarity and guidance as follows:

IS3 – Public Sewer Priorities

The immediate priority for connection to the public sewer and utilisation of the limited remaining capacity will be given to well-located infill projects that will make a positive contribution to the design quality, services, facilities and amenities in the village.

Recommendation:

No change recommended to the wastewater policy and objectives, apart from Objective IS3, which is recommended to be reworded to provide greater clarity and guidance as follows (main changes highlighted in bold):

IS3 – Public Sewer Priorities

*The **immediate** priority for connection to the public sewer and utilisation of the limited remaining capacity will be given to well-located infill projects that will make a positive contribution to the design quality, services, facilities and amenities in the village. **The longer term** priority will be to ensure that existing developments in the Village Core, the Inner Village and the catchment of the sewerage scheme are connected to the public wastewater system.*

On the proposal of Cllr S.Walsh and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report. but to also insert an objective into the plan to provide for a proper stand alone Tertiary Waste Water Treatment Plant to service Bearna.

A vote was taken on Cllr S.Walsh's proposal and the result was as follows;

AR SON, Cllr. Conneely, Cllr Feeney Cllr Hoade, Cllr. Hynes, Cllr Kyne, Comh Ní Fhatharta, Comh. O'Cuag Comh O'Tuairisg, Cllr. S. Walsh, Cllr Welby, Cllr. Willers (11)

AGHAIDH: Cllr Canney, Cllr. M.Connolly, Cllr. Joyce,, Cllr. McHugh Cllr. Reilly, (5)

Gan Votáil: Cllr Mullins. (1)

The Mayor declared Cllr S.Walsh's proposal carried.

2.10.3 Sub-Issue 10C – General Timing and Delivery of Infrastructure

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

A number of submissions refer to the lack of adequate services and infrastructure in Bearna to support the existing residents and state that no further development should be permitted until such time as infrastructure has been able to catch up. It is noted that unless this is done, developments will not be properly serviced and environmental impacts will worsen.

Response:

The LAP falls under the GCDP 2003-2009, which sets out the house construction allocation for Bearna. The LAP must be consistent with the County Development Plan but seeks to ensure that new development is properly serviced in accordance with applicable standards to protect the environmental qualities of the area. The LAP supports the provision of improved services and infrastructure to service existing developments in Bearna and future developments, but this is dependent on the resources available to GCC and will be improved over a period of time.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr S.Walsh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.10.4 Sub-Issue 10D – Waste Management & Recycling Facilities

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 21 – Coiste Céibhe Bhearna

Summary:

The above submissions raise issues in relation to waste management and the main issues have been summarised as follows:

- Waste management plans and suitable recycling facilities are required.
- Reuse of construction material in marina and other foreshore developments should be promoted.
- Adequate assessments should be undertaken in relation to the reuse, treatment, movement and disposal of waste construction materials.

Response:

The LAP policy and objectives with regard to waste management is as follows:

POLICY 2.8.2D | Waste Management

It is the policy of the Council to support the prevention, reduction and recycling of waste in Bearnna to ensure that as little waste as possible is remaining to be disposed of and facilitate the provision of adequate waste infrastructure, such as bring banks, at locations that will not adversely affect residential amenities.

IS10 | Prevention, Reduction and Recycling of Waste

Promote the prevention, reduction and recycling of waste in new developments. Applicants will be required to submit proposals demonstrating how this is to be achieved with planning applications.

IS11 | Bring Bank Facility

A bring bank facility for glass is required for the Bearnna Plan Area. It is recommended that the next large development, which includes a public facility such as restaurants or shops, be required to provide an area for the placement of bottle banks for the use of the general public. GCC will provide the bottle banks and will provide for the collection of the waste. The facility will be provided as a service to the domestic sector and it will not be permissible for commercial premises to use the facility.

It has also been proposed under Sub-Issue 9G above that a new paragraph be inserted in Section 4.1.12 of the LAP dealing with construction waste. This should be included to address the concerns raised above.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a new paragraph be inserted in Section 4.1.12 of the LAP dealing with construction waste as follows:

Where developments propose underground or semi-basement parking, they should consider: the existing ground conditions and any requirements for blasting or rockbreaking; the appropriate reuse, movement, treatment and/or disposal of any rock; and the amenity of existing residents and any nuisance control measures proposed, including the hours of operation of construction and demolition activities. An assessment of the above factors will be required with all such developments, to be carried out by a suitably qualified person to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. Applications for other development proposals that propose significant rock blasting, rockbreaking or removal should also be accompanied by an assessment as outlined above.

On the proposal of Comh Ni Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr S. Walsh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.10.5 Sub-Issue 10H – Marine/Foreshore Works

Submitted By:

- No. 20 – Mr. Eugene McKeown
- No. 46 – Seán Beatty
- No. 49 – Peter O'Fegan
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)

Summary:

The above submissions refer to marine/foreshore works that should be undertaken. The issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- Proposals for improving the pier and foreshore, including the use of large stones as a breakwater to protect the area between the Pier Road and Mag's Road from coastal erosion, a roadway with seating and picnic tables between the two roads, dredging of the pier area, improved parking on the pier, an area for small boats at the pier, the provision of a proper slipway, etc.
- GCC should have a policy to ensure that breakwaters are built at the southern end of Mags Boreen and Lacklea Boreen extending to a depth beyond that of the current pier.
- Propose that all coastal works allow for maintenance of existing rights of way held by shore rights/seaweed right holders.
- Draft LAP proposes marine based leisure facilities near Bearna Pier, which is a welcome development and vital to future growth of Bearna as a village with a proud maritime heritage. There is a natural breakwater west of pier and GCC should undertake a study of the area to determine the appropriate setting and scale of the new harbour. GCC should actively pursue the enhancement of harbour and new extended harbour as outlined by Coiste Ceibe Bhearna in their submission.
- Local rock removed from development sites should be used for creating breakwaters and other requirements at the foreshore.

Response:

The relevant objectives in the LAP are as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full

consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

Objective CF8 – Jetty/Marina Development

Consider the provisions of the Development Strategy for Marine and Leisure Infrastructure produced by the Marine Institute and the need for a feasibility study for the project. This should incorporate an engineering study and a cost benefit analysis and should determine whether the project would provide positive economic and social benefits to the region and that it would be viable in the long term.

NH36 – Coastal Protection

Promote the use of soft approaches to coastal protection that work with the natural features and processes at the foreshore.

It is considered that the above objectives provide the necessary overall guidance regarding marine/foreshore works and that it would not be appropriate for the LAP to propose specific works without further detailed investigation. Nonetheless, it is suggested that the wording of Objective CF7 be revised to provide greater clarity on the existing beaches and other facilities in Bearna and that Objective CF8 be revised to provide greater clarity regarding a jetty/marina development, marine/foreshore works and existing rights of way to the foreshore.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the wording of Objective CF7 be revised as follows:

Objective CF7 – Water-Related Facilities

Support the development of appropriate water-related facilities along the coastline. This could include the retention and enhancement of existing sandy beaches, the establishment of new beach areas as appropriate and the development of clubhouses for sailing or scuba diving clubs in the Village Core or other public, low impact facilities as the need arises. The enhancement and expansion of Silver Strand beach facility could be considered subject to more detailed investigation and a full consideration of the need for and impacts of such an initiative. This could include an additional beach area and parking facilities on the County side of the road, to be developed in conjunction with improved pedestrian and cycling access via greenway linkages along the coast and Silver Strand Road and possibly a widened Silver Strand Road with limited additional parking and passing bays. It would not be appropriate to include buildings or developments as this would substantially alter the character of the area.

It is recommended that the wording of Objective CF8 be revised as follows:

Objective CF8 – Jetty/Marina/Breakwater Development

Support the preparation of a feasibility study for a jetty/marina development to the east or west of Bearna Pier and any necessary marine/foreshore works to facilitate public access to and use of the area around the pier, such as breakwaters. This should incorporate an engineering study and a cost benefit analysis and should determine whether the project would provide positive economic and social benefits to the local community and the broader region and that it would be viable in the long term. The study should also consider the potential impacts of any proposal on the coastal environment and amenity, Bearna Pier and the Pier Road ACA and should be designed on a best practice basis to minimise environmental impacts, to optimise benefits to the local community and the broader region, to respect any

existing rights of way to the shore and to be complementary to land based uses and activities, including the Pier Road ACA, the proposed coastal amenity park and associated facilities. On the proposal of Cllr Mullins and seconded by Cllr McHugh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.10.6 Sub-Issue 10I – Local Streams/Surface Water Drainage

Submitted By:

- No. 9 – Tom Hernon
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 74 – Michael Kennedy

Summary:

The main issues raised in relation local streams/surface water drainage have been summarised as follows:

- Propose that IS13 be amended to allow for a maximum 6m wide buffer for Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream.
- Measures to alleviate surface water disposal (exacerbated by recent major developments) should be incorporated.
- Minimum culverting of streams will be needed to facilitate access to lands severed by streams and to back lands.

Response:

The relevant policy and objectives in the LAP are set out below:

POLICY 2.8.2B | Surface Water Drainage

It is the policy of the Council to support the provision of a public stormwater sewer in the village centre and the promotion of a Sustainable Drainage System approach and techniques in Bearna.

IS12 | Public Stormwater System

Support the implementation of the public stormwater sewer proposals for the village centre.

IS13 | Sustainable Drainage Systems

Support the application of SuDS throughout the Plan Area, based on the surface water drainage catchments and watercourses identified in Bearna, in order to:

- Reduce surface water runoff generated by hard surfacing in new development.
- Protect streams and associated habitats as ecological, visual and recreational resources.

IS14 | Surface Water Runoff

Surface water runoff from development sites will be limited to pre-development levels and will generally not exceed 2l/s/ha, with any excess runoff being attenuated on site. Methods that can be using include at source, conveyance and pipe end systems, as appropriate to the hydrology, topography and development proposed

IS15 | Local Streams

The existing streams in Bearna should be protected as follows:

- Restore and reinstate streams or portions of streams that have been filled in or covered over as part of new developments.
- Culverting of the streams should be restricted.
- There will be a general minimum 6m wide buffer on either side of streams to protect these watercourse and associated habitats. Additional areas should be incorporated as required to provide for attenuation, habitat conservation, etc.
- A minimum 10m buffer for the Trusky Stream and Liberty Stream to protect the watercourse and associated habitats and to provide for the new main green spine, amenity linkage and north/south connection across the Plan Area.

IS16 | Flooding

Once the OPW flood maps become, available, they will be incorporated into the Bearna Local Area Plan and, where necessary, the content of the plan will be amended to reflect this new information. This will include mapping the areas prone to flooding, their inclusion within the ecological network/sustainable urban drainage system for Bearna and any associated amendment of land use proposals considered necessary.

IS17 | Planning Application Information

All planning applications for developments consisting of more than single, one-off houses to be accompanied by a Hydrological Report and SuDS Proposal.

The above policy and objectives are considered necessary to provide for the protection of streams, their associated habitats and species, their ability to act as conduits for surface water, their capacity to deal with environmental pollution, their contribution to the visual amenity of the landscape and the provision of a connected and continuous amenity network that provides safe walking routes for the local community and visitors to Bearna.

The SEA proposed the following mitigation measure to protect existing streams in Bearna:

MM6

Prohibit the future channelling and piping of streams in Bearna.

It is therefore considered appropriate to retain the policy and objectives as currently set out in the LAP.

Recommendation:

No change recommended.

On the proposal of Comh Ní Fhartharta and seconded by Cllr Welby it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report including amendments already made.

2.11 Issue 11 – Development Management Guidelines

2.11.1 Issue 11 – General

Submitted By:

N/A

Introduction:

No submissions have specifically referred to the Development Management section of the LAP but certain submissions to raise concerns or propose changes that may affect the content of this section. These are addressed where appropriate under the relevant sub-issue and include the following:

- Sub-Issue 5A – Single Rural Houses/Local Housing Need
- Sub-Issue 5F – Commercial/Industrial Development/Local Economic Development and Tourism
- Sub-Issue 5L – Social and Affordable Housing
- Sub-Issue 7C – Sports and Recreation Facilities
- Sub-Issue 6E – Light Pollution
- Sub-Issue 7F – Amenity Network/Greenway Linkages

Responses and Recommendations:

The responses and recommendations are set out in the relevant sub-issue.

On the proposal of Cllr Mullins and seconded by Cllr McHugh it was agreed to accept the recommendation in the Manager's Report.

2.12 Issue 12 – Development Implementation Guidelines

2.12.1 Issue 12 – General

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 30 – Eddie & Ruth Fegan
- No. 31 – Michael & Margaret Davoren
- No. 47 – Aidan Donnelly
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 86 – Betty Kilbane
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly
- No. 104 – Brian Kenny (DoEHLG – Spatial Policy)

Introduction:

The above submissions raise issues in relation to the development implementation guidelines in the LAP, mainly in relation to the manner in which physical and social infrastructure will be delivered and the contribution scheme proposed in the LAP.

2.12.2 Sub-Issue 12A – Development Contribution Scheme and Funding

Submitted By:

- No. 14 – Seán Murray
- No. 28 – Davitt Geraghty (Barna Co-Op, aligned clubs & Scoil Sheamus Naofa)
- No. 48 – Enda Folan (Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 53 – Mairead Breathnach (Coiste Pobal Bhearna)
- No. 77 – Dermot Corcoran
- No. 78 – Yvonne Corcoran
- No. 94 – Peter & Michele Connolly

Summary:

The main issues raised in relation to development contributions and funding have been summarised as follows:

- LAP is too ambitious in proposing 1800 new homes given lack of supporting infrastructure and facilities, the influence of developers will mean that the village will always be lagging behind in infrastructural development and the LAP is largely silent as to how the necessary infrastructure will be put in place to meet the volume of new development.
- Based on past experience, no reason to believe that contributions from future developments will fund amenities in village and benefit the village.
- Barna Co-op propose that a €100 000 financial contribution per acre should be ring fenced for use in Bearna and an additional contribution based on number of dwellings should also be applied. Suggested that it be on a sliding scale from €65 000 per unit to €100 000 per unit depending on density (excluding one-off housing as defined by GCDP 2003-2009). A similar levy should also be imposed on commercial developments, suggested on a floorspace basis. Propose that portion of commercial rates now collected in Bearna be set aside to assist voluntary groups to maintain and develop community facilities and amenities in Bearna.
- Pobal Bhearna submission strongly supports community facilities and proposes that one way of providing amenities would be to require a developer (seeking planning permission for 4+ units) to make a contribution in excess of €100 000 per acre to a central fund to be ring-fenced for provision of local amenities in Bearna. A mechanism for collection and administration of these funds should be outlined in LAP.
- Coiste Pobal Bhearna states that contribution scheme proposed in the LAP will penalise the community of landowning families in Bearna as they will have to provide the land and/or money for community facilities and amenities in the interests of 'common gain'.

Response:

The above issues have also been dealt with under Sub-Issue 7G above.

The LAP has responded to the public consultation process undertaken in Bearna and supports the provision of a significant number of community facilities and amenities to serve the growing population in Bearna and to support the various sports activities within the Plan Area. The LAP includes an Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme (Section 4.2.1) intended to deliver lands for facilities in suitable locations and provides details of specific projects required to support the provision of these facilities (Section 4.2.3).

It is, however, beyond the scope of a local area plan to provide detailed cost estimates for acquiring funds/lands and ensuring the delivery of facilities or amenities. This is dependent on the level of development that occurs and the resources available to GCC to implement projects or purchase lands and will occur on an incremental basis over time as the village grows and develops.

The suggestion for alternative development contributions based on very high financial contributions are not considered to be appropriate given that they will place a major burden on landowners, will likely significantly increase house prices, may have unforeseen effects on the property market and will also not necessarily allow for the delivery of land in suitable locations for the provision of well-located, accessible facilities and amenities. The scheme proposed in the LAP has been formulated in order to facilitate the delivery of lands in suitable locations and to make better use of the open space requirements for new developments to contribute to the quality of the development and the broader community.

The LAP explicitly states under Section 4.2.1 that: *Any financial contributions will be ringfenced as part of a local fund to provide lands for community facilities, or as otherwise considered necessary by the Planning Authority, within the Bearna Plan Area.* This will ensure that contributions raised within the Bearna area will be invested back into the area. Nonetheless, the contribution scheme in the LAP would benefit from greater clarity and it is recommended that the wording of this section be refined.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the wording of Section 4.2.1 be amended as follows:

Section 4.2.1 Development Contributions and Bonds

General Development Contribution Scheme

A General Development Contribution Scheme has been prepared by GCC under Section 48 of the *PDA 2000* that applies to County Galway and which came into effect on the 8th March 2004. The scheme provides that conditions on grants of planning permission may be included requiring the payment of a contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area, that is provided, or that it is intended will be provided, by or on behalf of GCC. Copies of the scheme are available at the Planning Office and on www.galway.ie. Regard shall be had to the General Development Contribution Scheme 2004 for County Galway, and any other such scheme as may be published by GCC in the lifetime of the Bearna LAP.

Bonds and Securities

The Planning Authority will require developers to provide a security or bond for the proper completion of proposals with particular emphasis on large residential developments. The security required will be linked to the amount of roads, footpaths, lighting services and open space proposed.

Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme

The LAP proposes that an *Integrated Development and Community Gain Scheme* be made that applies specifically to the Bearna Plan Area. This scheme will facilitate the delivery of facilities and amenities to serve the local community and growing population in Bearna in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The scheme will be applied to new developments in the Bearna Plan Area and has been formulated in order to ensure that sufficient lands and/or funds can be generated to allow for an adequate level of facilities, amenities, infrastructure and services to be delivered to serve the specific development and the local community.

The proposed scheme will generally be applied on the basis of a minimum percentage of the total land area of the development site, to be contributed towards a general land bank for the provision of community facilities and amenities in suitable locations by GCC or other bodies as appropriate, or as otherwise required by the Planning Authority. The developer may also be required to provide the agreed facility or amenity on these lands, particularly where this forms an integral part of the overall development, such as a new greenway linkage, park or playground.

The extent of land contributed will be comprised of two main components. The first is an internal open space requirement integral to the development, which has typically been a minimum of 10 to 15% as set out under the *Residential Density Guidelines 1999*. The second is an additional requirement for the provision of community facilities and amenities and will generally range from 10 to 15%.

The combined land contribution required will typically range from a minimum of 20% to 30% of the land area and will be graded according to the Development Areas identified in recognition of the higher land costs in more central areas and the need to encourage the delivery of lands in the most suitable locations to make facilities and amenities more central and accessible to the local community and users that they serve and in the interests of promoting greater equity. This scheme will allow better use to be made of the lands acquired under the general open space provisions of the *Residential Density Guidelines 1999* and to allocate the lands to ensure that the optimum balance can be achieved between a high quality development layout with adequate internal open space and the delivery of lands for community facilities and amenities to serve the development and the local community.

The minimum land contribution requirement will be calculated in accordance with TABLE 4.2.1 below. The table also provides an indication of the types of community facilities and amenities that would be suitable in each area, although other options may also be considered, as outlined in SECTION 2.5.

TABLE 4.2.1 Development Contribution by Development Area		
Development Area	Minimum Contribution	Suitable Community Facilities and Amenities
Village Core	20% of total site area	Coastal Amenity Park & Seaside Promenade Community/Youth Centre Water- Related/Based Facilities (e.g. marina) Childcare Facilities & Children's Playground Public Transport Node/Village Square Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Inner Village	25% of total site area	National School Community/Youth Centre Sports Facilities & Public Parks Public Transport Node/Village Square Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Outer Village	25% of total site area	National School Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Rural Fringe	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Green Wedge	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities
Coastal Edge	30% of total site area	Sports Facilities & Public Parks Greenway Linkages/Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities Water-Related Facilities (limited, low-impact)