

Second Manager's Report
on submissions and observations
relating to the Draft CDP 2011-2017

VOLUME 2

**Responses to submissions
relating to mini-plan issues**

Contents of Volume 2

1. Responses to submissions in the Ballymote Electoral Area	1
Submissions relating to Ballinafad Mini-Plan	1
Submissions relating to Ballygawley Mini-Plan	3
Submissions relating to Ballysadare Mini-Plan (partial)	5
Submissions relating to Castlebaldwin Mini-Plan	7
Submissions relating to Collooney Mini-Plan	8
2. Responses to submissions in the Dromore Electoral Area	15
Submissions relating to Ballinacarrow Mini-Plan	15
Submissions relating to Ballysadare Mini-Plan (partial)	21
Submissions relating to Coolaney-Rockfield Mini-Plan	25
Submissions relating to Dromore West Mini-Plan	28
Submissions relating to Easky Mini-Plan	32
3. Responses to submissions in the Sligo-Drumcliff Electoral Area	45
Submissions relating to Ballincar Mini-Plan	45
Submissions relating to Carney Mini-Plan	64
Submissions relating to Cliffony Mini-Plan	67
Submissions relating to Drumcliff Mini-Plan	72
Submissions relating to Grange Mini-Plan	76
Submissions relating to Mullaghmore Mini-Plan	88
Submissions relating to Rathcormack Mini-Plan	95
Submissions relating to Rosses Point Mini-Plan	98
4. Responses to submissions in the Sligo-Strandhill Electoral Area	112
Submissions relating to Ransboro Mini-Plan	112
5. Responses to submissions in the Tobercurry Electoral Area	115
Submissions relating to Aclare Mini-Plan	115
Submissions relating to Banada Mini-Plan	117
Submissions relating to Cloonacool Mini-Plan	118
Submissions relating to Culfadda Mini-Plan	119
Submissions relating to Gorteen Mini-Plan	120
Submissions relating to Tourlestraun Mini-Plan	121
Appendix: List of persons and organisations that made submissions on the Draft CDP	

1. Responses to submissions relating to villages located in the Ballymote Electoral Area

Submissions relating to Ballinafad Mini-Plan

Submission no. 2

2 July 2010

Padraig Shannon, Chairperson Aughanagh Parish Council Ltd.
on behalf of Ballinafad Playground Development Committee

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to an area of land located within the centre of Ballinafad village. The submission requests that the lands be rezoned from 'open space' to 'community facilities' in order to facilitate the development of a playground.

Opinion

The subject lands are proposed to be zoned as 'open space' in the Draft mini-plan. As outlined in Chapter 13 of the Draft CDP, the zoning objective for 'open space' is to ensure the adequate provision and maintenance of public open space, to be developed and used for parks and playgrounds.

Given the intentions to develop a playground at this location it is considered that the 'open space' zoning clearly supports this aim and is the most appropriate zoning for these lands.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 18

28 August 2010

Sean Scott
on behalf of Aughanagh Parish Council Ltd.

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that proposals for the provision of a community pitch are accommodated on an area of land located directly to the rear of the Field Study Centre in Ballinafad.

Opinion

The land is proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft Ballinafad Mini Plan. The provision of a pedestrian link is proposed along the western boundary of the subject lands.

There are currently no playing pitches within the village of Ballinafad. Community facilities are limited to the Resource Centre and the Community Hall, and open space within the plan limit is limited to a small area within the centre of the village which is not suitable for the provision of a playing pitch. The proposal would therefore be considered a valuable asset in terms of its contribution to community facilities provision in the village.

The lands in question are predominately wet grassland with some small areas of scrub and are of low ecological value. However, much of the lands identified are designated under the National Monuments Acts as RMP SL 040 190. The archaeological feature in question is the Red Earls Road, an ancient trackway which cuts through the western half of the site.

Therefore, whilst the mini-plan should support the request in relation to these lands, the extent of the land suitable for development should be determined on the basis of appropriate archaeological assessment. This caveat should be clearly reflected in the mini-plan.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Ballinafad Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, to include the lands marked as 18a within the Development Limit and to zone the lands as 'sports and playing fields'.
- B.** The **Ballinafad Objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by outlining the subject lands as site CF1 (marked as recommended amendment 18b on map 4).
- C.** The following **objective** should be added to **Section 16.5**:

Encourage the development of sports and playing facilities on lands outlined as CF1 on the objectives map. However, having regard to the location of RMP SL 040 190 (i.e. archaeological feature known as Red Earl Road) on part of these lands, the extent of the lands suitable for development shall be determined on the basis of appropriate archaeological assessment.

Submissions relating to Ballygawley Mini-Plan

Submission no. 98

8 September 2010

Adi Haran

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that an area of land located to the east of Ballygawley village be zoned as 'mixed use' to facilitate the development of a community facility and houses. Alternatively the submission requests that the land be zoned 'residential' in order to accommodate the housing needs of family members.

The submission outlines the family's housing needs and the efforts over the years to progress the development of the lands.

Opinion

Ballygawley is categorised as a Secondary Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 250 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 240 persons for Ballygawley in 2010. The recommended population growth would represent an increase of 4.1%, which is consistent with the growth rate for the County between 2002 and 2006 (4.6%).

During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ballygawley will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties/properties under construction and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. The Draft CDP estimates that there are 16 residential units that are vacant or under construction in Ballygawley and these units alone have the potential to accommodate the residential requirements of the village during the plan period. If these houses were to become occupied it would represent an additional population of approximately 35 persons, or an increase of 14.5%. There is therefore clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential purposes.

There are currently no public wastewater treatment facilities available in the village. Whilst Table 9.B of the Draft CDP outlines proposals for the provision of a new treatment works, the progression of this scheme will be subject to the availability of funding and resources.

There are serious concerns in relation to road and pedestrian access at this location having regard to the poor alignment and limited width of the road, together with the absence of public lighting and footpaths. The development of the lands would require significant works including road realignment and the provision of public lighting and footpaths linking to the village.

The lands are located on the edge of the development limit and are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. Buffer zones are established in order to consolidate villages, to safeguard land for the future expansion of the village and for the provision of infrastructure, and to protect the amenities and nature conservation value of the surrounding area. The proposed rezoning would therefore conflict with this objective.

It is noted that the submission also suggests a 'mixed use' zoning. The aim of the 'mixed uses' zoning objective is to create a dynamic mix of uses able to create and sustain viable village centres. Due to the peripheral location of the lands it is considered that the proposal would conflict with this objective and lead to the fragmentation of village centre services and facilities.

Ultimately however, it should be noted that the currently proposed 'buffer zone' designation does not preclude all forms of development. Indeed the provision of a community facility, as proposed in this submission, would be 'open to consideration' in accordance with the Zoning Matrix as outlined in Chapter 13 of the Draft CDP. Furthermore, the accommodation of rural-generated housing need would also be facilitated subject to compliance with the details set out in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1, and subject to compliance with all other standard development management criteria.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, together with the potential that already exists within the 'buffer zone', it is considered that there is no justification for the zoning of these lands for 'mixed uses' or 'residential' use.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions on Ballysadare Mini-Plan

(Ballymote Electoral Area)

N.B. The Ballysadare River provides the dividing line between the Ballymote Electoral Area and the Dromore West Electoral Area. Therefore, whilst this section of the report deals with submissions within the Ballymote Electoral Area, it should also be read in conjunction with the section dealing with submissions within the Dromore West Electoral Area.

Introduction

A significant aspect of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Ballysadare is categorised as a Principal Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 1500 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 1311 persons for Ballysadare in 2010. The recommended population growth of 189 persons would therefore represent a significant increase of 14.4%, which would be consistent with the significant growth rate experienced between 2002 and 2006 (13.8%).
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ballysadare will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are approximately 250 vacant residential units in the village with the potential to accommodate approximately 550 persons. Whilst these units alone would easily accommodate estimated residential requirements during the plan period, the Draft mini-plan also includes 3.1 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 2.85 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have potential to provide at least 60 additional residential units, thereby allowing for the accommodation of a further 131 persons.
- The Draft mini-plan therefore already provides for a potential additional population of 681 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which would represent a 52% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 6.1 hectares additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 73 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 161 persons. Having regard to the existing potential of the Draft Mini-plan to accommodate 681 persons, there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Gary McGinty, Consultant Town Planner & Engineer

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to an area of land located to the north of Ballysadare village. The submission requests the rezoning of these lands from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘residential uses’ and outlines that the lands are zoned residential use in the current CDP 2005-2011.

The submission argues in favour of the residential zoning having regard to the location of the site adjoining existing residential development, the village core, the old railway station and existing public transport links. It is argued that access to existing services is available and that development of the site would not be injurious to the visual amenities of the area.

The submission contends that this area would be appropriate for the future expansion of Ballysadare as it would counteract the perceived expansion of the village in a south-western and western direction.

Opinion

Similar to other plots throughout the County, the Draft CDP proposes to change the zoning of these lands from ‘residential uses’ to ‘buffer zone’ due to the oversupply of residential-zoned land and vacant residential units compared to projected population growth and residential requirements. This is outlined in detail in the ‘introduction’ section above.

The subject lands extend to 3.35 hectares and would have the potential to accommodate at least 40 residential units, thereby allowing for a potential population increase of approximately 88 persons.

The site is located on the periphery of the settlement on elevated and exposed land. It is considered that development on the lands would be visible over a wide surrounding area and would therefore detract from the amenities of the area.

Access to the site is extremely poor as the adjoining road is substandard in terms of width, surface and alignment. To the south, this road forms part of a hazardous junction (J3) that has been identified for improvement in the Draft mini-plan. Furthermore, pedestrian access is extremely hazardous with no public footpath available to link these lands to the village centre. Given the traffic intensive nature of additional housing development, a residential zoning would not be recommended at this location.

It is not considered necessary to counteract expansion of the village in a south-western and western direction. Indeed it is considered that development has been spread relatively evenly around Ballysadare in recent years with the northern and eastern parts of the village experiencing significant development.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Castlebaldwin Mini-Plan

Submission no. 137

8 September 2010

Bernard Scott, on behalf of Joseph and Marie Scott

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to a portion of land located to the side and rear of the primary school. The lands to the side (southwest) of the school are proposed to be zoned 'community facilities' in the Draft Castlebaldwin Mini Plan. The submission requests that these lands not be zoned for 'community facilities' as this would result in lands to the rear becoming 'landlocked'. The submission highlights the extent of vacant and permitted residential development in the village, contends that these lands may be suitable for lower density housing in the future, and suggests the availability of more suitable land for community facilities to the northeast of the school.

Opinion

The planning authority acknowledges the significant extent of existing and permitted residential development in the village. Indeed, the extent of residential development experienced in recent years is the very reason for the proposed zoning of additional land for 'community facilities' in the Draft mini-plan, thereby attempting to ensure that the increasing needs of the local community can be satisfactorily met.

The planning authority would encourage the consolidation of community facilities and the shared use of facilities/resources/services between varying community groups. Accordingly these lands beside the existing school were proposed to be zoned for 'community facilities'. However, concerns in relation to the potential 'landlocking' of lands to the rear are acknowledged and it is agreed that the road frontage lands should be reviewed.

Whilst the submission refers to lands to the northeast of the school, it is noted that these lands are located to the rear of existing houses and access/development may therefore be problematic. Accordingly it is considered that additional lands to the rear (southeast) of the school should be zoned for 'community facilities', thereby alleviating concerns in relation to access to the remainder of these lands.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Castlebaldwin Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning of the lands to the southwest of the school site (marked as **137a**) from 'community facilities' to 'buffer zone'.
- B.** The **Castlebaldwin Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning of the lands to the southeast of the school site (marked as **137b**) from 'buffer zone' to 'community facilities'.
- C.** **Section 24.5.A** of the Draft CDP should be amended as follows:

Promote the provision of community facilities on the existing school site and the adjoining site to the south-west east. Shared use of resources and facilities will be encouraged on both sites.

Submissions relating to Collooney Mini-Plan

Introduction

All of the submissions received relate to the ‘business and enterprise’ lands located along the N4 National Primary Route. A significant portion of these lands has already been developed and is mainly comprised of various business / retail parks. Of particular note is the scale of retail / retail warehousing development which has taken place at this location and the vacancy rates that now exist.

The main issues raised in the majority of submissions relates to further retail / retail warehousing development at this location. Given the scale and importance of this issue, together with the significant number of submissions received, it is considered appropriate to first discuss in detail the issue of further retail / warehousing development at this location.

The Sligo City and County Joint Retail Planning Strategy 2010 – 2017

The Sligo City and County Joint Retail Planning Strategy 2010 – 2017 identified that there was 3,997 sq.m. of occupied retail warehousing floor space within Collooney, with a further 4,775 sq.m. of vacant retail warehousing floor space. Given recent economic conditions and retail trends, it is likely that vacancy rates have increased significantly since 2008. Furthermore, planning permission had been granted for an additional 5,702 sq.m. of retail warehousing floorspace at this location, giving a potential overall retail warehousing floor space of almost 15,000 sq.m.

To put this in context, there is a total of 32,442 sq.m. of retail warehousing floorspace in the entire County, including 23,864 sq.m. in Sligo City and Environs. Collooney could therefore potentially account for almost half of all the retail warehouse floor space in County Sligo.

The strategy identifies Sligo City as the County’s main focal point in retail terms and highlights its importance as a key retail centre for a hinterland extending beyond the county boundaries. The existing allocations for further retail warehousing in the Environs area (at Carowroe and Lisnalurg) are supported in the strategy but the capacity analysis does not support the case for further such allocations throughout the county.

In relation to Collooney, the strategy recommends a restriction on further retail warehousing and highlights the need to focus retail investment in the village centre.

The Sligo and Environs Development Plan 2010-2016

The SEDP incorporates the recommendations of the Retail Strategy and again identifies Sligo City as the primary retail centre in the County and the focus for comparison retail development. It is stated that the Carrowroe and North Fringe (Lisnalurg) Retail Parks will ensure a north-south balance and may help reduce the amount of retail warehousing scattered around the Docklands.

It is stated that careful monitoring is required to ensure that Sligo City can continue to provide an appropriate scale and quality of retail floor space, sufficient to meet the needs of its future population and fulfil its strategic role within the North-West.

The Draft Sligo County Development Plan 2011 – 2017

Consistent with the above documents, the Draft CDP recognises the mono-nodal nature of the County and acknowledges that most new retail floorspace will be provided in Sligo City during the plan

period. Prospects of growth in the smaller towns of the County are limited and the thrust of development plan policy is to maintain and enhance the existing retail environment to serve and benefit local communities.

Retailing Planning policy P-RP-7 generally discourages retail outlets in excess of 500 sq.m. within the County as developments of this size are clearly intended to serve more than a local catchment and therefore would be more suitably located within Sligo City and Environs area.

Retail Planning Objective O-RP-2 aims to restrict the further development of retail warehousing in Collooney and encourages the conversion of vacant units to appropriate alternative uses.

Section 4.1.4 (Industry and enterprise locations) states that Collooney, originally earmarked for the development of an enterprise park, has seen the short-lived development of retail warehousing, to the detriment of Sligo Retail Park. It is stated that development at this location should revert to the originally intended industrial/enterprise use and that the proliferation of retail warehousing outside the Gateway should be curtailed.

The Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2005

The guidelines state that out-of centre retail developments should not be allowed if their provision is likely to lead to a reduction in the range of local facilities in towns and villages. In relation to retail warehousing it is stated that adverse impacts on town centres should be avoided if appropriately controlled. However, it is stated that retail parks in the range of 8,000 – 15,000 sq.m. (i.e. similar to that already permitted in Collooney) have the potential to adversely impact on smaller town centres.

Furthermore, the Guidelines also discourage large retail centres located adjacent to or close to existing, new or planned national roads as this can lead to the inefficient use of costly and valuable infrastructure and may have the potential to undermine the regional / national role of the roads concerned. This is particularly relevant given the location of the subject lands along the N4 National Primary Route. It should be noted that submission no. 57, from the National Roads Authority, welcomes proposals to restrict further retail warehousing development at this location.

Conclusion and recommendations

The policy documents outlined above support the Draft CDP's aim of restricting further retail / retail warehousing type developments in Collooney. The reasons underpinning this objective are as follows:

- to focus investment and development in the Gateway of Sligo City in order to strengthen its retail role, and to aid its transition from a third tier to a second tier shopping centre in the national hierarchy;
- to encourage retail development at an appropriate scale relative to the size and projected role of Collooney. Currently there is an extremely high retail vacancy rate in Collooney which clearly demonstrates that there is no need for additional retail warehousing at this location. A restriction on further development would help focus investment into the existing vacant units;
- retail / retail warehousing development at this scale clearly has potential to adversely impact on the vitality and viability of the existing small village centre in Collooney, thereby diminishing the range of activities and services that it can support and causing an increase in the number of vacant properties in the primary retail area;
- further development of retail development on the lands to the east of the N4 may lead to an inefficient use of costly and valuable infrastructure and may have the potential to undermine the regional / national transport role of the road concerned;

- the short-lived development of retail warehousing has adversely affected the potential for development of these lands for industry and enterprise, as originally planned.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is recommended that further retail / retail warehousing development (i.e. excluding that already constructed and/or permitted) should be discouraged on the lands proposed to be zoned for 'business and enterprise' in the Draft Collooney mini-plan.

Submissions no. 75 - 79, 81 - 89

8 September 2010

Duggans Architects & Engineers, on behalf of various interests
in relation to lands to the east of the N4

These submissions were received from a combination of individual tenants, premises owners and land owners within the business parks located to the east of the N4. Much of the submissions' content is similar in nature and is therefore dealt with under issue 1 below. However, where individual submissions raise specific issues, separate reference is provided.

Issue no. 1

The submissions outline the planning histories of the various sites involved and the policies that apply under the current CDP 2005-2011. The main thrust of all these submissions are requests that:

- a) the proposed zoning and zoning matrix associated with the lands contained is amended to permit in principle retail / retail warehouses / retail showroom / discount stores / amusement arcade / transport depot uses / swimming pool / leisure uses and other general uses;
- b) in objective O-RP-2, the wording "restrict further development of Retail Warehousing in Collooney" be removed;
- c) in section 4.1.4 the final sentence stating that "the proliferation of retail warehousing outside the Gateway area should be curtailed", should be removed;
- d) a paragraph be included stating that the proliferation of vacant units in this area should be addressed and that consideration will be given to a full range of uses on a 'case by case' basis.

Opinion

The response to the various aspects of this issue is as follows:

- a) The submissions request that a number of potential uses should be permitted in principle on these lands. Whilst some specific uses are mentioned, the submission is extremely vague in stating that "other general uses" should also be permitted in principle.

The Draft CDP has adopted a two-pronged approach towards the consideration of proposals on these lands. Firstly, new development proposals shall be restricted to business and enterprise uses only. Secondly, a more flexible approach is adopted towards existing vacant properties in an attempt to address vacancy rates. However, in both cases, retail or retail warehousing development is not permitted under any circumstances. This approach is considered appropriate having regard to the concerns outlined in the 'introduction' above.

It should be noted that the zoning matrix is intended to serve as a general guide for development throughout the County and can not be considered exhaustive or definitive. However it is noted that the Collooney mini-plan makes reference to the matrix in section 27.7.A by stating "Lands zoned for business, enterprise and light industry shall be restricted to uses that are consistent with

this zoning category, as outlined in the zoning matrix”. It should be noted that this policy would relate to new developments only and would not affect existing units that were permitted as retail warehousing or otherwise. Given the scale and variety of development that has occurred at this location, and having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is considered appropriate that any further development should be limited to business and enterprise development only. However, revised wording should be used to clarify that this relates to new developments only.

The more flexible approach towards existing vacant units is reflected in section 27.7.B, which states that “**In addition to details set out in the zoning matrix**, the planning authority will consider a range of suitable uses for these properties, including activities relating to the creative industries, recreational and cultural uses, exhibitions etc.”. It is considered that this approach should be retained. However, having reviewed this policy it is considered that the reference to the zoning matrix should be amended in order to avoid any confusion regarding the intended flexibility of this approach.

Given that the zoning matrix is only intended to serve as a general guide for development, it is not considered appropriate to address these specific Collooney issues by amending the matrix. However, given that a number of potential uses have been raised in this submission, it is considered appropriate to discuss the suggestions. In this regard the planning authority would continue to discourage retail, discount stores and retail warehousing on all lands and units to the east of the N4. Retail showrooms would also be undesirable unless the showroom was a small element of a larger manufacturing / wholesaling use.

Section 27.7.B of the Draft Plan states that consideration will be given to recreational proposals in existing vacant units. This could therefore potentially accommodate the suggested amusement arcade / swimming pool / leisure uses. However, such proposals would not be accommodated on greenfield sites as they would be restricted solely to business and enterprise uses.

However, in relation to the proposed use as a ‘transport depot’, it is noted that this is ‘normally not permitted’ within ‘business and enterprise’ areas. Such a potential use should be distinguished from public transport facilities and should generally be ‘open to consideration’ on lands zoned for ‘business and enterprise’. Therefore, whilst this issue does not exclusively relate to the subject lands, the general matrix should be amended to leave such uses ‘open to consideration’.

In summary, it is considered that the existing policies of the Draft CDP and Draft Collooney Mini-Plan are appropriate subject to some minor clarifications. The policies allow for additional business and enterprise development on greenfield lands, whilst applying an extremely flexible approach towards potential uses for existing vacant units. The only stated exception to this is in relation to further retail / retail warehousing which should continue to be discouraged having regard to the concerns outlined above.

b-c) As outlined above, concerns in relation to retail warehousing still apply and accordingly these statements should be retained.

d) This has been covered in (a) above, whereby it has been outlined that a flexible and supportive approach will be taken towards proposals for existing vacant units. Again however, retail and retail warehousing should not be permitted having regard to the concerns outlined above.

Issue no. 2

In addition to some of the general issues outlined above, submission no.77 (Duggan Architects & Engineers on behalf of Eamon Barrett) requests that a small area of land beside the existing

wastewater treatments works be rezoned from ‘utilities’ to ‘business and enterprise’, and that the site of an adjoining dwelling house be rezoned from ‘business and enterprise’ to ‘utilities’.

Opinion

The lands are located adjacent to the N4 on the northern periphery of the development limit. The small area of land to the south of the wastewater treatment plant is currently zoned ‘utilities’ and the site of the existing dwelling house to the east is zoned ‘business and enterprise’.

It is proposed to expand Collooney wastewater treatment plant to increase capacity to 5000PE (population equivalent) and this scheme is currently listed in the planning phase of the Water Services Investment Program 2010 – 2012. It is recommended that no changes to the existing public utilities zoning is permitted pending the completion of this planning phase. It is also proposed to reserve land at this location for a sludge management station in accordance with the Sludge Management Plan for County Sligo. As it is recommended to retain this ‘utilities’ zoning, there is also no requirement to change the zoning of the adjoining house to ‘utilities’.

Issue no. 3

In addition to some of the general issues outlined above, submission no. 78 (Duggan Architects & Engineers on behalf of various individuals) recommends that an “Action Plan” be put in place as part of the Collooney Mini Plan in order to attract investment and new business.

Opinion

The Draft CDP is an strategic planning framework aimed at achieving sustainable development throughout the County. The Draft Collooney Mini-Plan, contained therein, is primarily a land-use plan aimed at reserving adequate land to accommodate growth in various land uses, protecting the surrounding environment, and providing advice and guidance on the design and layout of future development. It is therefore a facilitator in terms of economic development.

The suggested “Action Plan” would be aimed at attracting new business and investment and is therefore more akin to a business plan. Such a document is not considered appropriate for inclusion in the Draft CDP.

Recommendations

A. Section 27.7 should be amended by deleting the text **in red**, and replacing it with the text **in blue**:

Proposals for new developments on lands zoned for **business, enterprise and light industry business and enterprise** shall be restricted to uses that are consistent with this zoning category, as outlined in the zoning matrix. Retail or retail warehousing developments will not be permitted under any circumstances.

Subject to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, **and particularly compliance with point A above**, a flexible and supportive approach will be adopted towards proposals for alternative uses for existing vacant properties on these lands. **In addition to details set out in the zoning matrix, Notwithstanding the details set out in the zoning matrix**, the planning authority will consider a range of suitable uses for these properties, including activities relating to the creative industries, recreational and cultural uses, exhibitions etc. **Again however, further retail or retail warehousing developments will not be permitted under any circumstances.**

B. The Zoning matrix should be amended to indicate that a ‘transport depot’ will be ‘open to consideration’ within lands zoned as ‘business and enterprise’.

Anthony Gallagher, Architect
on behalf of Terry Gannon & Des Butler

Issue No. 1

The submission contends that Collooney functions as an outer layer to the core that is Sligo Town Centre and questions the concerns raised in the Draft CDP regarding the proliferation of retail / retail warehousing developments at this location. It is argued that the good road network serving Collooney should be capitalised upon by allowing further development.

It is stated that the Zoning Matrix is too rigid and recommends that these lands should accommodate any economic activity that is proven to be viable in the long term and which will assist in developing a synergy to the benefit of all promoters.

Opinion

Collooney is situated approximately 13 kilometres south of Sligo City. It is designated as a Principal Gateway Satellite in the Draft CDP and a Small Town for Urban Strengthening in accordance with the Border Regional Planning Guidelines. It does not function as an outer layer of Sligo Town Centre.

The issues raised in this submission are essentially covered in response to the submissions by Duggan & Associates (above). Again it is considered that further retail / retail warehousing development should be discouraged and that, subject to the recommended amendments outlined above, the Draft CDP already incorporates sufficient flexibility in terms of potential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Manager's Supplementary Recommendations

MSR-36

Issue

This issue concerns lands surrounding the existing cemetery to the east of Collooney. Under the Draft CDP it is proposed to reserve lands to the north of the cemetery to accommodate its extension. However, it is noted that there is an archaeological monument affecting the site and this may hinder its potential.

Accordingly it is considered that these lands should be changed to 'buffer zone' and alternative lands to the east of the cemetery should be reserved for its extension.

Recommendation

The **Collooney Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning of the lands annotated as MSR 1a from 'community facilities' to 'buffer zone', and by changing the zoning of the lands annotated as MSR 1b from 'buffer zone' to 'community facilities'.

MSR-37

Issue

The Village Profile of Collooney, as set out in section 27 of the Draft CDP, indicates that there are two primary schools and two churches in the village. However, there are three of each and this should be reflected in the Draft CDP.

Recommendation

In **Section 27** of the Draft CDP, under the heading 'Community facilities', the reference to "two primary schools, two churches" should be omitted and replaced with "three primary schools, three churches".

2. Responses to submissions relating to villages located in the Dromore Electoral Area

Submission relating to Ballinacarrow Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant feature of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development or a mix of uses including residential development. The vast majority of lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Ballinacarrow is categorised as a 'village supporting the rural community' and has a recommended population level of 200 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 132 persons for Ballinacarrow in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 51%, compared to a recorded drop of 1% for the population of the wider Ballinacarrow area between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ballinacarrow will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are 25 vacant residential properties in the village, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 55 persons.
- Accordingly just approximately 0.49 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Ballinacarrow Mini-Plan including 1.5 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 0.7 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 23 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 52 persons.
- The Draft CDP therefore already provides for the accommodation of an additional 107 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned land) which if permitted, would represent an 81% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for approximately 25 residential units.
- The wastewater treatment system in the village has a design capacity of 250PE (population equivalent) and is currently overloaded. Whilst a scheme is proposed to provide an increased treatment capacity, progression of this scheme will be subject to the availability of funding and other resources.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 7 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses or a mix of uses including residential. This would result in the potential for the provision of approximately 70 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of at least 154 persons, which would represent a 116% increase on the existing population. This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and, accordingly, there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 10

24 August 2010

Brendan L. Johnson Solicitors
on behalf of Margaret Keane

This submission relates to a stated landholding of 13.6 hectares in Ballynacarrow South. The land has limited frontage onto the N17, which is proposed to be zoned for a combination of ‘mixed uses’ and ‘open space’ in accordance with the Draft CDP.

Issue no. 1

The landowner feels that a disproportionate amount of her lands along the roadside boundary are intended to be zoned for ‘open space’ (marked as site 10.1 on map 1) and expresses her wish that these lands should be zoned for ‘mixed uses’. It is stated that Mrs. Keane has no difficulty with an appropriate portion of her remaining lands being zoned for ‘open space’ in the context of possible future development.

Opinion

It should be noted that the village is lacking in terms of the availability of landscaped public amenity space and accordingly the subject lands were identified as being suitable for the provision of such a facility in conjunction with the development of the adjoining lands, which were proposed to be zoned for ‘mixed uses’. Having reviewed the zoning and associated objectives for this site, it is acknowledged that this approach may be overly rigid and prescriptive.

It should be noted that it would be a requirement of any such mixed-use development to provide open space, regardless of the proposed zoning. Whilst the planning authority would still contend that these lands offer the potential for the development of quality open space, it is considered that a more flexible approach could be applied which would allow the developer more options whilst still complying with the overall objectives for the site. The entire site could therefore be zoned for ‘mixed uses’ subject to the inclusion of a site specific objective requiring that any development proposal would incorporate a quality public amenity space.

Issue no. 2

The submission expresses concern about the extent of the remainder of this landholding (marked as 10.2 on map 1) proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ and requests that the development limit be extended “to the boundary of her lands with the new National Primary Route”.

Opinion

These lands are proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ in accordance with the Draft CDP, the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further urban sprawl throughout the plan area.

Whilst the submission requests that the development limit be extended significantly, it should be noted that it does not outline the desired zoning for the subject lands. However, given the nature of the submission it would appear that the intentions are for mixed uses or residential development.

It is considered that sufficient lands have already been zoned in the Draft mini-plan to cater for the anticipated demand for mixed uses and residential development over the plan period. This portion of

the subject lands extends to approximately 5 hectares and would have the potential to provide approximately 50 additional houses. This would accommodate an additional population of approximately 110 persons, which would represent an 83% increase on the current village population.

There would also be concerns that the zoning of these lands would have the potential to encroach on the proposed N17 Collooney to Tobercurry Bypass Realignment scheme, for which the CPO line has not yet been finalised.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is not recommended that the development limit should be extended to include the subject lands. The lands should therefore remain as 'buffer zone'.

Recommendations

- A. The **Ballinacarrow Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as 10a from 'open space' to 'mixed uses'.
- B. The **Ballinacarrow Objectives Map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by removing the OS1 designation from the lands marked as 10b, and by enlarging the VC2 site to include these lands.
- C. **Section 15.1.A and B (in red)** should be deleted and replaced with the following objective (in blue):

Reserve land for the development of a landscaped public amenity space at site OS-1. The site may be developed independently or in conjunction with the overall development of site VC-2.

In order to avoid subdivision of site OS-1, vehicular access to the backlands shall be incorporated along the north-eastern or south-western boundaries of the site.

Require the provision of quality open spaces in conjunction with the development of lands within the development limit.

- D. **Section 15.4.D** of the Draft CDP (in red) should be deleted and replaced by the following objective (in blue):

Any development proposal on village centre site VC-2 should:

- Overlook the public open space area to the front of the site;
- Incorporate a higher density of development, subject to suitable design and layout.

Any development proposal on village centre site VC-2 should be based upon a masterplan approach that incorporates a quality-designed and easily accessible public open space area (minimum 25% of total site area). To balance the provision of this open space area, development on this site may incorporate a higher density, subject to suitable design and layout.

Submissions no. 19 and 45

30 August 2010

Adrian Benton

Issue no. 1

The submission notes that the rear garden of Mr. Benton's property in Ballinacarrow village is proposed for partial zoning as 'mixed uses', whilst the remainder of the plot is outside of the development limit and is within the proposed 'buffer zone'. The submission objects to the proposed 'buffer zone' on grounds of future plans for the development of a dwelling for a family member.

Opinion

Given that a significant portion of these lands is already proposed to be zoned as ‘mixed uses’ (which includes residential), there is obviously the potential to accommodate residential development on this portion of the lands.

Furthermore it should be noted that, as outlined in response to Submission 114 (refer to Volume 1) proposals for one-off houses can be accommodated in the ‘buffer zone’ subject to the demonstration of genuine rural-generated housing need and compliance with all other standard development management criteria. Accordingly there is no requirement to amend the zoning objectives in this case.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 21

30 August 2010

Dr. John O’Grady

Issue no. 1

The submission outlines objection to the proposed zoning of his land for ‘community facilities’. It is stated that this is the only land in his ownership and that it is his intention to build a residence on this site when he returns to his native home place. It is noted that the lands were zoned to accommodate the expansion of the school and it is suggested that alternative family lands to the rear of the school could be made available for this purpose.

Opinion

The intentions for the construction of a house are noted. Whilst concerns have been outlined above in relation to the extent of land zoned for residential uses, it should be noted that the proposal would constitute infill development of one small site only. This would not make a significant contribution to the overall extent of lands zoned for residential uses and critically, given that the site would constitute infill development, would not set a precedent for further expansion into the proposed ‘buffer zone’.

The availability of lands for the expansion of the school to rear is also noted and this would be considered a suitable alternative for the zoning of ‘community facilities’. Accordingly there is no objection to the residential zoning as requested.

Recommendations

- A. The **Ballinacarrow Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as 21a from ‘community facilities’ to ‘residential uses’.
- B. The **Ballinacarrow Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands to the northwest of the school (marked as 21b) from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘community facilities’.
- C. **Section 15.5.B** of the Draft CDP should be amended as follows (text to be deleted **in red**, text to be added **in blue**):

Reserve land to the **west and north northwest** of the existing primary school to allow for its possible future expansion and/or the provision of other community facilities.

Submission no. 25

31 August 2010

Eamon Keaney

Issue no. 1

This submission relates to lands on the south western edge of Ballinacarrow which adjoin a recently completed multiple housing development. Mr.Keaney requests that the development limit be extended and that lands in his ownership be zoned for ‘residential uses’ to enable the expansion of the existing housing development at this location. It is stated that the sewage infrastructure in the existing development can cater for this, and that there is demand for additional housing.

Opinion

As outlined in the Introduction to this section, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential development on the basis of the extent of residential vacancy and the existing supply of land zoned for residential uses. The subject lands extend to 1.1 hectare and would have the potential to provide at least 12 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 26 persons.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ in accordance with the Draft CDP, the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further urban sprawl throughout the plan area.

There would also be concerns that the zoning of these lands would have the potential to encroach on the proposed N17 Collooney to Tobercurry Bypass Realignment scheme, for which the CPO line has not yet been finalised.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is not recommended that the development limit should be extended to include the subject lands. The lands should therefore remain as ‘buffer zone’.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 39

5 September 2010

Breege Berreen

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a former commercial property (shop) in Ballinacarrow which is proposed for zoning as ‘residential uses’ in the Draft CDP, and requests that this be changed to ‘mixed uses’ in light of the historic use of the premises.

Opinion

It is acknowledged that there is a long established commercial history on these lands and therefore there is no objection to the proposed zoning as ‘mixed uses’. However it is noted that the submission refers to two plots, only one of which has this history of commercial use. Therefore the remaining plot (dwelling house to the northeast) should remain zoned as residential.

Recommendation

The **Ballinacarrow Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as 39a from 'residential uses' to 'mixed uses'.

Submissions no. 59 and 128

7 September 2010

Dermot O'Grady

Issue no. 1

It is requested that the proposed development limit be further extended along the Coolaney Road to enable a change of zoning on a site from 'buffer zone' to 'residential uses'. It is stated that the proposed site is intended for sale and that the plot in question represents a small proportion of his overall landholding at this location. The site is stated to be suitable for residential development because it is within the speed limit, it can be served by existing infrastructure (sewerage, public lights, footpaths, etc.), it is on a local road and it is convenient to the village centre.

Opinion

The lands in question are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for residential uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further ribbon development along this road.

Development within the 'buffer zone' must be strictly controlled, particularly on the edge of existing settlements. Therefore, whilst one-off housing may be permitted in cases of genuine rural-generated housing need (as outlined in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1), speculative development as proposed would be unacceptable.

The subject lands are not connected to the village with appropriate public footpath and lighting facilities, and accordingly there would be traffic hazard concerns in relation to any further development along this road.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is not recommended that the development limit should be extended to include the subject lands. The lands should therefore remain as 'buffer zone'.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Ballysadare Mini-Plan

(Dromore West Electoral Area)

N.B. The Ballysadare River provides the dividing line between the Ballymote Electoral Area and the Dromore West Electoral Area. Therefore, whilst this section of the report deals with submissions within the Dromore West Electoral Area, it should also be read in conjunction with those within the Ballymote Electoral Area.

Introduction

A significant aspect of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Ballysadare is categorised as a Principal Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 1500 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 1311 persons for Ballysadare in 2010. The recommended population growth of 189 persons would therefore represent a significant increase of 14.4%, which would be consistent with the significant growth rate experienced between 2002 and 2006 (13.8%).
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ballysadare will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are approximately 250 vacant residential units in the village with the potential to accommodate approximately 550 persons. Whilst these units alone would easily accommodate estimated residential requirements during the plan period, the Draft mini-plan also includes 3.1 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 2.85 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have potential to provide at least 60 additional residential units, thereby allowing for the accommodation of a further 131 persons.
- The Draft mini-plan therefore already provides for a potential additional population of 681 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which would represent a 52% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 6.1 hectares additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 73 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 161 persons. Having regard to the existing potential of the Draft Mini-plan to accommodate 681 persons, there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 110

8 September 2010

Bernadette Rabbit, McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd.
on behalf of Carty Contractors

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to an area of land located along the N59 adjacent to the western development limit of the Ballysadare Mini Plan. The submission requests the rezoning of these lands from 'sports and playing fields' to 'business and enterprise', in order to facilitate the relocation of the applicants plant / machinery hire business.

Opinion

The lands are located on the western periphery of the village, within the development limits, and are proposed to be zoned 'sports and playing fields' in the Draft Mini Plan. The lands were being used temporarily by Ballysadare GAA club pending the development of sports facilities at Young's Quarry which are now operational. The lands are located adjacent to other lands proposed to be zoned as 'business and enterprise'.

The applicant currently operates the company's primary base in the northwest on a premises located within Ballysadare village, which is proposed to be zoned 'mixed uses' in the Draft mini-plan. The current village centre location is considered inappropriate due to the nature of the business and the traffic implications associated with movement of heavy vehicles. This is particularly relevant given the location of the premises between two schools. The relocation of these operations to the subject lands would be desirable given their location outside the designated village centre and the easier access provided from the N59. The proposed zoning would also be consistent with the proposed 'business and enterprise' zoning of the adjacent lands to the east.

Recommendation

The **Ballysadare Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as **110a** from 'sports and playing fields' to 'business and enterprise'.

Submission no. 111

8 September 2010

Bernadette Rabbit, McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd.
on behalf of Shane, Patrick & Aidan Carty

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to an area of land located to the southwest of the old cemetery at Kilboglashy. The submission requests the rezoning of these lands from 'community facilities' to 'low density residential' use in order to accommodate serviced sites. The submission outlines that the lands are zoned for residential use in the current SCDP 2005-2011.

The submission argues in favour of the residential zoning having regard to the proximity of the lands to the town centre, the suitability of the lands for development, forecast population growth in excess of 50% for Ballysadare over the Plan period, and the appropriateness of a low-density residential zoning as an alternative to one-off housing in the surrounding rural area. It is also stated that there is already an adequate amount of land zoned for 'community facilities'.

Opinion

The Draft plan proposes to change the zoning of the subject lands from 'residential uses' to 'community facilities'. The lands extend to 2.7 hectares and would have the potential to accommodate at least 32 residential units, thereby allowing for a potential population increase of approximately 71 persons. Similar to other plots throughout the County, this was proposed due to the oversupply of residential-zoned land and vacant residential units compared to projected population growth and residential requirements. This is outlined in detail in the 'introduction' section above.

In this regard it should be noted that the submission's assertion that the Draft CDP forecasts growth in excess of 50% for Ballysadare between 2011 and 2017 is inaccurate. The actual maximum growth rate forecasted is 14.4%, which in itself is significant and perhaps overly optimistic, but can nonetheless still be easily accommodated in accordance with the Draft mini-plan as outlined in the 'introduction'. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential use.

Ballysadare has already experienced significant residential growth in recent years. The Draft CDP estimates that the population has increased from 853 in 2002 to 1311 in 2010, a growth rate of 35%. Accordingly, the Draft mini-plan adopted an approach aimed at shifting the balance of growth from residential growth to the appropriate provision of community facilities to serve this increased population. Accordingly it was proposed to change the zoning of the subject lands from 'residential uses' to 'community facilities'.

It should be noted that surrounding greenfield lands are also proposed to be zoned for community facilities. In this regard the potential for the creation of a community complex is recognised, whereby various community uses and groups could be consolidated and avail of shared facilities, resources and services in a co-ordinated and planned manner. Whilst the submission points to an excess of lands zoned for 'community facilities', it should be noted that this report recommends that some of this land be omitted (see manger's supplementary recommendations below). The subject lands are therefore considered an appropriate replacement.

Regarding the suitability of the lands for residential development, it should be noted that the lands are steeply sloping and very elevated in places. These characteristics mean that it would be extremely difficult to successfully absorb quality residential development on the site without adversely impacting on the amenities of the area.

Access to the site is extremely poor as the adjoining road is substandard in terms of width, surface and alignment. To the south, this road forms part of a hazardous junction (J1) that has been identified for improvement in the Draft mini-plan. Furthermore, pedestrian access is extremely hazardous with no public footpath or public lighting available to link these lands to the village centre. Given the traffic intensive nature of additional housing development, a residential zoning would not be recommended at this location.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Manager’s Supplementary Recommendations

MSR-34

Issue

This issue concerns lands located to the east of the block-making plant at Harringtons Quarry (marked as MSR 1 on Map 3). These lands are currently undeveloped but are extremely elevated and exposed. Any development of the lands would be visible over a wide surrounding area at this very sensitive location at Ballysadare Bay.

The lands are proposed to be zoned as ‘community facilities’ in the Draft CDP. Having reviewed the Draft Plan, and having regard to the details outlined in response to submission no. 111 (above), it is recommended that the proposed zoning of these lands be changed from ‘community facilities’ to ‘buffer zone’.

Recommendation

The **Ballysadare Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning of the lands marked as MSR 1 from ‘community facilities’ to ‘buffer zone’. The lands should be excluded from within the development limit accordingly.

MSR-35

Issue

Having reviewed the issues raised in submission no. 111, it has also been noted that bullet point 3, as contained in section 20.3.D, contains an incorrect reference to this area as being ‘residential’. Revised wording should therefore be provided to reflect the proposed ‘community facilities’ zoning.

Recommendation

The **third bullet point of section 20.3.D** should be amended by deleting the wording (in red) and adding new wording (in blue):

From the Cemetery Road (L 7615) westward, **along the north side of the new residential zone through the area zoned for community facilities**, to the existing road accessing the **quarry primary school**;

Submissions relating to Coolaney-Rockfield Mini-Plan

Introduction

Both submissions received are essentially requests to zone additional lands for residential development. All of the lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft Plan. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Coolaney-Rockfield is categorised as a Secondary Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 900 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 862 persons for Coolaney-Rockfield in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 4.4%, compared to a rate of 4.6% experienced throughout the county between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Coolaney-Rockfield will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are 57 vacant residential units in the village, which would have the potential to accommodate an additional population of approximately 125 persons. These units alone would therefore accommodate residential requirements during the plan period.
- In addition to this the Draft CDP and Coolaney-Rockfield Mini-Plan include 12.46 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 4.5 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 185 residential units, which would accommodate approximately 409 persons.
- The Draft CDP therefore already provides for a potential additional population of 534 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands) which would represent a 62% increase on the estimated current population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for a total of approximately 70 residential units.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 3.8 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of at least 45 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of approximately 100 persons. This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

James Drew and Associates
on behalf of Noel Deane

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a backland site in Coolaney village that is situated adjacent to the Owenbeg River, and states that the lands are “designated as ‘buffer zone’ and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC)” in the Draft CDP. The submission notes that the lands are presently zoned for ‘Residential Uses’ in the current mini-plan, with associated objectives for a buffer zone along the river and the extension of the riverside walkway from the village.

It is stated that a recent planning application for a multiple housing development on these lands was unsuccessful (PL08/191 refers).

The submission highlights and summarises a number of proposed objectives in the draft plan which refer to residential development and also in relation to the Owenbeg River and adjoining lands which form part of the Unshin River SAC. It is stated that the mini-plan proposes that future development of the settlement will be limited to lands to the north west of the existing village and that development of the subject site would comply with this objective.

The submission states that the owner/developer would undertake the necessary enhancement and mitigation works necessary to realise the development plan’s objective for lands adjacent to the river in terms of conservation, natural amenity and access, as part of any future residential development at this location. It is contended that, if left undeveloped, the site could become a wasteland and attract anti-social behaviour to the rear of the existing dwellings bordering this site.

The submission also maintains that the proposed change of zoning in the current draft plan would have a detrimental effect by reducing the value of the site by removing any viable future development potential. It is therefore requested that the current ‘residential uses’ zoning for these lands is retained.

Opinion

The lands referred to in this submission are located adjacent to the Owenbeg River and the main portion of site lies within the boundaries of the designated Unshin River Special Area of Conservation (site code 001898). It should be noted that the SAC designation is not imposed by the Draft CDP as these areas are designated under the EU Habitats Directive. Nonetheless, it is an objective of the Planning Authority to discourage any development that could damage or destroy such sites of national or international importance designated for their wildlife/habitat significance. It is therefore considered that the proposed rezoning of these lands for residential purposes would conflict with this objective. It is also noted that during the course of assessment of the planning application on this site (PL08/191), the NWRFB expressed serious concerns about the development of this site.

As outlined in the ‘introduction’ (above) there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential development on the basis of the extent of residential vacancy and the existing supply of land zoned for residential uses. The subject lands extend to 1.4 hectares and would have the potential to provide 16 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 36 persons.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. A ‘river buffer zone’ also applies along the northern margin of these lands and it is the policy of the Draft CDP to retain this area free from development. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore

conflict with these aims and would result in the potential loss of lands within an internationally designated site on the basis of its wildlife/habitat significance.

Notwithstanding the constraints outlined above, the restricted configuration of these lands leave the potential for achievement of a residential development with an appropriate design and layout extremely limited. Concerns were also raised in this regard in the refusal of planning permission under PL 08/191.

Having regard to the concerns outline above, the subject lands should remain as ‘buffer zone’.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 106

8 September 2010

L.J. Lipsett

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to lands in Rockfield, to the rear of the ‘Mountain Inn’ premises at the south western fringe of the existing settlement, and requests that these lands be zoned as per the current CDP. Plans for the future development of these lands are outlined with particular regard to their proximity to the local school, church, shop, public house, adequate road frontage and the availability of utilities infrastructure to service future development at this location.

Opinion

It should be noted that not all of these lands were zoned for development in accordance with the current CDP. Whilst the area to the north of the reservoir is zoned for a combination of ‘residential uses’ and ‘mixed uses’, the area to the south of the reservoir is currently zoned as ‘buffer zone’.

In the Draft CDP the area of land zoned for ‘mixed uses’ has been retained whilst the remainder of the lands, excluding a small portion of land beside the reservoir zoned for ‘public utilities’, has been proposed for zoning as ‘buffer zone’. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims.

As outlined above, there is no justification for the zoning of additional land having regard to residential vacancy levels and the extent of land already zoned for residential uses. The subject lands extend to 2.4 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 28 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 63 persons. Significant portions of the subject lands are very elevated and considered unsuitable for residential development on visual amenity grounds. The adjoining public road is substandard in terms of width and alignment. There is no public footpath or lighting services linking the lands to the village centre. Accordingly there are traffic hazard and pedestrian safety concerns in relation to any proposed residential zoning.

Having regard to the concerns outline above, the subject lands should remain as ‘buffer zone’.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Dromore West Mini-Plan

Introduction

Submissions received include requests to zone additional lands for residential development. All of the lands involved in this regard are proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ in the Draft Plan. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Dromore West is categorised as a ‘village supporting the rural community’ and has a recommended population level of 275 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 200 persons for Dromore West in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 37.5%, compared to an exceptionally high rate of 44% recorded for the wider Dromore area between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Dromore West will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that 2.51 hectares would be required to meet residential requirements during the plan period.
- This requirement has already been met with the Draft CDP and Dromore West Mini-Plan including 10.02 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 3.4 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 149 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 330 persons.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for a total of approximately 100 residential units.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 2.1 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 25 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of approximately 55 persons. This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 36

3 September 2010

Jarlath Neary

Issue no. 1

The submission objects to the proposed zoning of his lands on the western side of Dromore West village (annotated as 36.1 on map 1) for ‘sports and playing fields’ uses, stating that they are presently in use for agricultural purposes and that the owner has no intentions other than to continue farming the lands in question.

Opinion

The future intentions for the use of these lands are noted. However, it is considered that provision should be made for the development of sports and playing fields within the development limit in recognition of the lack of any such facilities within the village or surrounding area. In this regard the subject lands are deemed to be suitable given their proximity to the main residential areas of the settlement.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the proposed zoning does not have any implications for the continued agricultural use of the lands by the landowner. Any future change in this agricultural use could only be carried out in consultation with the landowner.

Issue no. 2

The submission outlines a case for extending the development limit of the village in an easterly direction along the N59 as far as the Flying Horse pub, on the basis that it would then include the pub, a church, function hall, a motor business and some additional housing. As part of the proposed extension of the development limit, it is requested that a plot of land owned by Mr. Neary on the southern side of the N59 (annotated as 36.2 on map 1) would then have its zoning changed from 'buffer zone' to 'residential uses' in order to accommodate the development of housing for some family members who wish to reside in the village.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential uses having regard to the extent of land already zoned in the village and recommended population levels. The subject lands extend to almost 1 hectare and would have the potential to provide at least 12 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 26 persons.

The determination of the proposed development limit was informed by, amongst other things, the extent of the built-up area, the need to manage future development, and having regard to various constraints including speed limits. The subject lands are located outside the proposed development limit and are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for residential uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

Furthermore, the area proposed for inclusion adjoins the N59 National Road at a point where the 100kph speed limit applies. Accordingly, it would be contrary to national policy to include the subject lands within the development limits and there would be serious concerns in relation to traffic hazard. As outlined in section 12.6.2 of the Draft CDP, development involving a new means of access onto a National road would only be permitted in a limited number of cases.

However, in relation to the stated family housing needs, it should be noted that a 'buffer zone' designation does not preclude the accommodation of cases of genuine rural-generated housing need subject to compliance with the criteria outlined in response to Submission 114 (in Volume 1) and all other standard development management criteria. Accordingly there is no requirement to zone the lands for residential development on the basis of family housing requirements.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, and the potential to accommodate rural generated housing needs in the ‘buffer zone’, it is not recommended that the subject lands should be zoned for residential development.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 46

7 September 2010

Dermot Browne

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that lands on the northern edge of Dromore West, adjoining the Easkey Road (R297), be included within the development limit and be zoned for ‘residential uses’. It is pointed out that planning permission had been granted for a dwelling on this site, which was not constructed due the downturn in the economy, and has since lapsed. Mr. Browne has indicated his intention to re-apply for permission on this site.

Opinion

The subject lands are zoned for a combination of ‘buffer zone’ and ‘residential uses’ in accordance with the current CDP. However, the entire lands were proposed to be zoned ‘buffer zone’ in accordance with the Draft CDP 2011-2017 having regard to the oversupply of lands zoned for residential uses and projected housing requirements outlined in the ‘introduction’ above. The subject lands extend to 1.12 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 13 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 30 persons.

The lands marked on the map accompanying the submission extend significantly beyond the area which previously had the benefit of planning permission for the development of a house under PL 04/1435. It should be noted that PL 04/1435 was granted on the basis of a genuine rural-generated housing need and that, despite the proposed ‘buffer zone’ designation, such a proposal would again be accommodated subject to compliance with the details outlined in response to submission no. 114 and all other standard development management criteria. There is therefore no requirement to zone the lands for residential uses on the basis of family housing needs.

The lands adjoin two roads which are designated as Scenic Routes in the Draft CDP and accordingly there would be concerns in relation to the protection of visual amenity at this location, particularly given the elevated and exposed nature of the lands.

The lands are located outside the 50kph speed limit zone and are not connected to the village centre with appropriate public footpath and lighting services. Accordingly there would be serious concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, and the potential to accommodate rural generated housing needs in the ‘buffer zone’, it is not recommended that the subject lands should be zoned for residential development.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 50

7 September 2010

P.J. Flynn

Issue no. 1

The submission outlines the landowner's objection to the continued zoning of his lands at Knockaculleen Td., on the western edge of Dromore West, for 'sports and playing fields' uses. It is stated that it is his intention to continue farming this land and that the lands may be unsuitable for playing pitches having regard to the slope of the ground at this location.

Opinion

The issue raised in this submission has largely been dealt with in the Planning Authority's response to submission No.36, which outlined the need for such facilities and the potential to continue agricultural uses on these lands.

In relation to the sloping nature of the site, it is considered that this issue could be satisfactorily addressed by the completion of necessary groundworks if deemed necessary.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Easky Mini-Plan

Introduction

A notable feature of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development or a mixture of uses including residential. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Easky is categorised as a ‘village supporting the rural community’ and has a recommended population level of 400 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 310 persons for Easky in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 29%, compared to a rate of 14% experienced between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Easky will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are 21 vacant residential units in Easky, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 46 persons.
- This would leave an outstanding land requirement of approximately 1.66 hectares to meet new residential requirements during the plan period. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Easky Mini-Plan including 6.02 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and approximately 1 hectare of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 80 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of 175 persons.
- The Draft mini-plan therefore provides for an additional population of 221 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant housing and zoned lands), which would represent a 71% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for approximately 80 residential units. These units alone have the potential to accommodate projected housing requirements.
- The wastewater treatment system in the village has a design capacity of 450PE (population equivalent) and is currently operating near capacity. No future upgrade has been identified.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of approximately 3 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of at 36 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of approximately 64 persons. This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 8

19 August 2010

Margaret Conlon, Secretary
on behalf of Easkey Community Council Ltd.

The submission from the Community Council highlights the tourism potential of Easkey arising from its unique coastal setting, natural amenities and local facilities, and proposes a number of future developments which would enhance its attractiveness as a tourist destination, ultimately giving rise to increased employment and business opportunities locally.

The submission contends that the lack of suitable and affordable accommodation for tourists, particularly since the loss of the caravan park in the village about 10 years ago, and the poor public transport system locally, means that Easkey is not fulfilling its potential as a tourism destination and accordingly is missing out on the consequential economic benefits which would accrue should visitor numbers increase and be able to stay overnight in the village. It is noted that the public toilet facility near Roslea Castle is no longer open and that campers and those with caravans who wish to stay in the area have little choice but to park illegally by the 'Coast Road'.

Issue no. 1

A proposal is put forward for the development on lands adjoining Roslea Castle (marked as site 8.1 on map 1) of a maritime museum complex which could provide accommodation for up to 100 people, incorporating a multi-purpose area suitable for a range of public uses and facilities for persons staying in an associated caravan/camping park.

Opinion

The lands in question lying adjacent to Roslea Castle are particularly sensitive and have very limited capacity to absorb further development due to their relationship with the castle and its prominent setting on the coastline which is designated as a *visually vulnerable area* in the current CDP and the Draft CDP. The adjoining public road forms part of a designated *scenic route*, whilst the site is also located on the margins of a designated *sensitive rural landscape* as per the current CDP and Draft CDP.

Roslea Castle is a Recorded Monument (SL011-020 – Castle Tower House) and the associated archaeological constraints area encompasses the majority of the site being proposed for development.

Having regard to the apparently significant scale of the proposed development, together with the visual and archaeological sensitivities outlined above, it is considered that this site would not be suitable for the project proposed in this submission. Furthermore, whilst the planning authority would support the provision of tourism facilities, it is considered that the subject site is detached from the existing built-up and serviced area of Easkey. It is considered that more suitable sites exist closer to the village, where such facilities would be easily accessible and where existing businesses in the village could benefit from associated spin-off effects.

Issue no. 2

The Community Council also proposes the development of a caravan/camping park at a village centre location adjacent to the Community Centre (marked as site 8.2 on map 1).

Opinion

It is observed that many of the submissions received in relation to the Easkey mini-plan bemoan the loss of the former caravan park and the associated spin-off economic activity it generated, whereby

considerable numbers of people visited the area on a regular basis and stayed for extended periods over the years that it was operational. A proposal for a caravan/camping facility is therefore to be welcomed. The proposed site is convenient to the village centre and would adjoin existing community facilities at this location.

Furthermore the site is largely screened from public view which would greatly diminish the extent of visual impact as a result of the proposed development. If a fully serviced facility of this kind was established at this location it would offer a real alternative to those who park caravans or pitch tents informally along the coast road at present. There is therefore no objection to the change of zoning as requested.

Issue no. 3

A further proposal for the development of a karting track on a 16 acre site to the east of the village (marked as site 8.3 on map 1) is also included in the submission.

Opinion

The location identified for the proposed Karting Track is situated at the edge of the plan limit and beyond the development limit. As such the lands are located within the proposed 'buffer zone', the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The lands are also located between two designated Scenic Routes and the coastline which is designated as Visually Vulnerable.

However, certain forms of development, including those of a sporting and recreational nature are 'open to consideration' within the 'buffer zone' as outlined in the Zoning Matrix (Chapter 13) accompanying the mini-plans.

The subject site is significantly detached from the village itself and it would be inappropriate to prescribe a specific zoning to an individual parcel of land so far outside the development limit, particularly given the unique nature of this proposal. Given that such a proposal would be 'open to consideration' in any case, it is recommended that the site should remain as 'buffer zone' and that the merits, or otherwise, of the proposal would be better assessed through the planning application process.

Recommendation

The Easkey Zoning map should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the development limit to include the lands marked as 8a and by changing the zoning objective of these lands from 'buffer zone' to 'tourism related uses'.

Submission no. 33

2 September 2010

David Rolston

This submission has been made on behalf of Patrick Rolston (landowner), who owns part of an area in Easkey that is proposed for 'tourism related uses' (site TOU-2) in accordance with the Draft CDP. This submission should be read in conjunction with submissions 44, 72 and 69.

Issue no. 1

The landowner objects to the proposed zoning of these lands as solely for 'tourism related uses' and instead requests that it be zoned for a mix of uses which would enable the development of a site for a one-off house for a family member if so required.

Opinion

This issue must be dealt with in conjunction with submissions 44, 72 and 69. It is noted that these submissions refer to site TOU-2 and invariably they have requested that it not be zoned for 'tourism related uses' for different reasons. This includes submissions from both landowners and other interested parties. Given the extent of objection, it would appear unlikely that such a proposal would progress successfully. Furthermore, as outlined in response to submission no. 8, alternative lands have now been recommended for use as 'tourism related uses' and it is considered that these lands would be a suitable replacement for site TOU-2. There is therefore no objection to removing the 'tourism related uses' zoning and 'TOU-2' designation from the lands the subject of this submission and adjoining lands to the north.

It is noted that a mix of uses is requested for this site, which would enable the construction of a one-off house for a family member. In this regard it should be noted that 'mixed uses' zoning would include residential uses and accordingly the concerns regarding additional residential land-zoning would apply, as outlined in the 'introduction' above. Furthermore, it is considered that the 'mixed uses' area should generally aim to consolidate the existing village centre. The subject lands are significantly detached from same and would encourage the fragmentation of the village core.

Ultimately it would appear that the primary concern of this submission would be the accommodation of a one-off house for a family member if needed. In this regard it should be noted that rural generated housing would be accommodated in the 'buffer zone' subject to compliance with the details set out in response to submission no. 114, and all other standard development management criteria.

It is therefore considered inappropriate to rezone the lands for 'mixed uses', and that in the absence of a 'tourism related uses' zoning, the subject lands and adjoining lands to the north should be zoned as 'buffer zone'.

Issue no. 2

The submission contends that in the current economic climate, and having regard to the multiplicity of landowners involved, there is no prospect of tourism related developments being planned for the lands in question (site TOU-2) and that focus should be on developing the Roslea Castle site (site TOU-1). A copy of a draft proposal prepared by a community group for the development of the Easkey seafront has been enclosed for consideration (see submission no. 69 for more detail).

Opinion

As outlined in response to issue no. 1, the difficulties associated with site TOU-2 are acknowledged and it is now recommended to zone these lands as 'buffer zone'. In relation to site TOU-1, please see responses to submissions 8 and 69 for more detail.

Recommendations

A. The Easky zoning map should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective of the lands marked as 33a (i.e. all the lands proposed to be zoned for 'tourism related uses' in the

B. The **Easky objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by removing the site designated as 'TOU-2' and the proposed pedestrian link between these lands and adjoining lands to the west.

C. Objective 33.6.C (in red) should be deleted.

~~Encourage the development of tourism focused commercial development on site TOU-2. Residential development such as holiday homes and caravan parks will not be permitted on these lands. Any development proposal for these lands should:~~

- ~~▪—create appropriate streetscape along the adjoining public road and provide a distinctive aspect along the northern extremity of the site;~~
- ~~▪—be based on an co-ordinated masterplan approach;~~
- ~~▪—be limited to two storeys in height and reflect the scale and character of existing development within the village;~~
- ~~▪—incorporate design features which take advantage of available panoramic views of the castle and coastline;~~
- ~~▪—include proposals for the relocation of the access road to the adjacent wastewater treatment plant in order to provide a consolidated layout;~~
- ~~▪—make provision for pedestrian links to site OS-1;~~
- ~~▪ incorporate an appropriate buffer zone around the wastewater treatment plant.~~

Submission no. 44

6 September 2010

Eamon Scanlon TD

This submission should be read in conjunction with submissions 33, 72 and 69. It relates to a plot of land in Bunowna Td., adjacent to the wastewater treatment plant serving Easkey, and forms the northern part of a site proposed for zoning for 'tourism related uses' and designated as TOU-2 in accordance with the Draft CDP.

Issue no. 1

The submission expresses an objection to the proposed zoning as 'tourism related uses' and requests that the land be zoned for 'residential uses'. It is stated that the site is fully serviced.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 33, it is now recommended to zone these lands as 'buffer zone'. It is not recommended to zone the land for residential uses given the concerns outlined in the 'introduction' regarding the extent of land zoned for residential uses, existing residential vacancies and infrastructural capacity.

Whether the subject site is serviced or not, this is not considered an appropriate basis for zoning land for residential development. As outlined in response to submission no. 33, it is recommended that the subject lands be zoned as 'buffer zone'.

Recommendations

Other than that already outlined in response to submission no. 33, no change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 55

7 September 2010

Patrick Leonard

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to lands on the south eastern approach to Easkey along the R297. The lands are located just beyond the proposed development limit of the Draft Easky mini-plan and the submission contends that the development limit should be extended to include the subject lands.

It is stated that this would be a logical and 'more natural' development limit for the village, given that the lands are also within the 50kph speed limit and are served by the public lighting network. The submission requests that the development limit be extended and that the lands be zoned for 'residential uses'.

Opinion

The subject lands include an existing dwelling on a very large site and are very much on the fringe of the existing settlement. The existing house on this site is visually disconnected from the row of cottages adjacent to the cemetery. One of the considerations in determining the extent of the development limit of any settlement is the distance from the recognised village centre and the built-up area. For this reason it was recommended to terminate the development limit at the end of the existing row of cottages, it being the last continuous form of development at the edge of the village.

The lands in question are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for residential uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further ribbon development at this location.

Although the lands comprise a single house and its curtilage, the zoning of the lands for 'residential uses' would enable the potential for more significant residential development (approximately 7 houses) which would be discouraged in accordance with the concerns outlined earlier. It should be noted that the existing residential use on these lands would always be taken into consideration in relation to any future development proposals. There is therefore no requirement to zone the lands for residential uses on this basis.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 65

7 September 2010

Martin A. & Mary B. Timoney

Issue no. 1

Mr. Timoney is a Research Archaeologist and his submission outlines the archaeological significance of Roslea Castle and the adjoining lands to the south. He states that he is aware of proposals for a building “akin in layout to a motel” on such lands and is of the opinion that extensive and in-depth archaeological research in the form of full research excavation over the entire site would be a necessary precursor to any such development. It is recommended that no development should take place at this location and the whole area should be tidied up in order to preserve the setting of Roslea Castle, whilst other locations should be considered for the proposed facility.

Opinion

This submission should be read in conjunction with submissions 8 (discussed earlier in this report) and 69 (see below for discussion).

The Draft mini plan for Easkey identifies a small plot of land at this location (site TOU-1), with a stated objective to support the development of a small-scale tourist facility and the enhancement of the existing car-parking area on council lands at Roslea Castle. The Castle and the majority of the lands surrounding it are identified in the Record of Monuments and Places for Co. Sligo and are thus afforded protection under the National Monuments Acts. The Draft CDP includes a number of objectives for the protection of the archaeological monuments and their setting.

At such an open and visible location on the coast, and as outlined in response to submission no. 8, any significant development at Roslea Castle, apart from an upgrading of the existing public facilities and car park, would be inappropriate and injurious to the archaeological heritage and amenity of the area.

It is therefore considered that this area has already been afforded adequate protection and no further changes to the Draft CDP are necessary on foot of this submission.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 69

8 September 2010

Denise Clarke

on behalf of Easkey Seafront Proposal Group

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that lands immediately south of Roslea Castle (marked as 69.1 on map 1) be zoned as ‘open space’ and not ‘buffer zone’ as currently proposed.

Opinion

The proposed designation of these lands as ‘buffer zone’ in the Draft CDP has been done with the very aim of protecting these sensitive lands from inappropriate development. However, it is acknowledged that this could also be achieved through an ‘open space’ designation and that such a designation would better provide for the extension of the linear open spaces along the river to the coastal area. There is therefore no objection to the requested zoning. Although any scope for development within the ‘open

space' area would be extremely limited, it should be noted that any such proposal would be subject to archaeological assessment and other standard development management criteria.

Issue no. 2

A proposal to develop Easkey Sea Front (marked as 69.2 on map 1) as an outdoor recreation area for local residents and visitors is put forward for consideration. The development would include a playground, skate park, barbeque area, camping in designated areas, along with other associated facilities. It is proposed to demolish the existing toilet block and replace it with an eco-friendly building for uses ancillary to the proposed development.

Opinion

As outlined in responses to earlier submissions (No.8 and No.65), the sensitivity of the coastal area in terms of archaeology, visual and natural amenity etc, means that there is an extremely limited capacity to absorb further development. However, the type of activities suggested in this proposal would appear to be low impact and would be considered compatible with the enjoyment of the existing amenities at this location.

The finer details of any such proposal would obviously be subject to full assessment at a later stage. However, at this stage it would be considered appropriate to zone the lands for 'open space', thereby allowing for further extension of the 'open space' area east of the Castle. This would accommodate potential for the creation of a quality linear park extending from the village centre along the river and further eastward along the coastline.

The reference to replacement of the existing toilet block is already supported in the Draft CDP in section 33.6.B.

Issue no. 3

The submission expresses concerns that development on site TOU-2 (marked as 69.3 on map 1) would interfere with public views from the R297, which is a designated scenic route, and requests that the proposed zoning of 'tourism related uses' be changed to 'buffer zone'.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 33, it is now recommended that these lands should be zoned as 'buffer zone'. However it should be noted that this change would not necessarily preclude all development, as certain types would be open to consideration within the 'buffer zone'. Any such proposal would have to be considered on its merits.

Issue no. 4

The submission requests that the plan limit be extended in an easterly direction (marked as 69.4 on map 1) so that the proposed 'buffer zone' is also extended to include the remaining lands next to the Coast Road (designated Scenic Route). The aim of this proposal is to protect views from the designated Scenic Route.

Opinion

Having reviewed this matter it is considered that this designated Scenic Route would provide a strong and appropriate plan limit. There is therefore no objection to the extension of the plan limit and the zoning of these lands as ‘buffer zone’.

Issue no. 5

It is proposed that Sligo County Council make bye-laws which would prioritise pedestrian movements along the coast road and that camping and overnight stays be permitted on public lands adjacent to the road, which would be managed on behalf of the local community.

Opinion

The making of bye-laws which prioritise pedestrian movements along the coast road would not be considered appropriate. Cycling and pedestrian facilities can be developed as green corridors (greenways) where practical and feasible. The provision of green corridors for cycling, which can be designed to include pedestrians, is included in Objective O-CW-1 of the Draft CDP. Furthermore, the making of bye-laws is a process that is separate to the CDP process.

Issue no. 6

It is observed that the lands proposed for ‘business & enterprise’ zoning include the site of a former factory now in use as a family resource centre and a sports hall, whilst existing enterprise units within the village have not been identified as such on the zoning map.

Opinion

The purpose of the zoning map is to identify appropriate future uses for general areas of the village, not to identify the current use of individual sites. It is therefore inevitable that some anomalies will be identified. However, the existing use of any site will always be taken into consideration and the important issue is that individual uses should be consistent with the zoning objective for the general area.

The community uses referred to in the former factory would be ‘open to consideration’ within ‘business and enterprise’ lands as set out in the zoning matrix (chapter 13). The existing enterprise units are located on lands zoned as ‘mixed uses’ in the Draft CDP and would be ‘normally permitted’ in accordance with the zoning matrix.

Having regard to the above it is considered that these uses are consistent with the overall zoning objectives and there is no need to alter the zoning map.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Easkey Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the development limit southward of the Castle to include the lands marked as **69a**, and by changing the zoning objective for these lands from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘open space’.
- B.** The **Easkey Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the development limit and plan limit eastward of the Castle to include the lands marked as **69b**, and by zoning these lands as ‘open space’.

- C. The **Easkey Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the plan limit eastwards to include the lands marked as **69c** and by zoning these lands as ‘buffer zone’.

Submission no. 72

8 September 2010

David Corfield

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to the lands zoned for ‘tourism related uses’ and denoted as TOU-2 in the Draft Easkey Mini-plan. It maintains that no development should take place on this site and that the site should instead be included in the ‘buffer zone’ to preserve the views and aspect available at this location. It goes on to state that site specific objective should include provisions to protect the existing views enjoyed by properties adjoining the southern boundary of the site and that any such development would be single-storey only, in keeping with development in the immediate environs.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 33, it is now recommended that these lands should be zoned as ‘buffer zone’. However it should be noted that this change would not necessarily preclude all development, as certain types would be open to consideration within the ‘buffer zone’. Any such proposal would have to be considered on its merits.

Issue no. 2

Furthermore, the submission states that no development should occur east of the river, north of the R297 – Regional Road, or along the sea road, because the views and aspects at this location are of such importance to Easkey, for residents and visitors alike.

Opinion

Having regard to the changes recommended in response to submission no. 33, essentially all of the greenfield lands at this location are now recommended to be zoned either as ‘buffer zone’ or ‘open space’. It is considered that this affords sufficient protection to these lands. However, it should be noted that all types of development can not be precluded as certain types of development would be open to consideration within the ‘buffer zone’. Any such proposal would have to be considered on its merits but would be subject to strict control given the sensitivity of the area.

Recommendation

Other than that already outlined in response to submission no. 33, no change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions no. 90, 94, 127 and 140

8 September 2010

Neville Finnerty, Annie Gibson, Vincent O'Brien,
Jamie & Tracey Wood

Issue no. 1

These submissions note that an objective for a pedestrian access from site VC-1 to the Main Street has been included in the Draft mini-plan and surmises that the only existing opening in the terraced street is the intended means of access. The inclusion of this objective is objected to on the basis that it would involve creating a public right of way over a shared access serving four privately owned properties, which ultimately would result in an infringement of privacy and the loss of private property for the respective property owners.

Opinion

The location of the pedestrian linkage between site VC-1 and the Main St., as shown on the Easkey Objectives Map, is only indicative and does not define the exact location of any such linkage. This is clearly outlined in section 13.3.C of the Draft Plan, which further states that any such route would have to be agreed with developers/applicants during the planning application process.

Notwithstanding this however, the concerns of the landowners are noted. In this regard there would be no objection to removing the proposed pedestrian linkage from the map and suitably amending the written objectives of the plan.

Recommendations

- A. The **Easkey Objectives map** shall be amended as shown on map 4, by removing the proposed pedestrian link between site VC1 and adjoining lands to the south.
- B. **Bullet point 3**, as contained in **section 33.4.D**, shall be amended by adding the following wording (in blue):

Incorporate pedestrian links to the Main Street, *subject to appropriate design and the agreement of the owners of land on which any such link is proposed;*

Submission no. 125

8 September 2010

Richard Morrissey

Issue no. 1

The submission proposes the development of a 40+ pitch, caravan and camping facility with attendant buildings on lands to the south of Easkey village. Two existing farm buildings are to be refurbished as part of the proposal and it is an aspiration to ultimately provide a carbon neutral facility. The rationale for the proposed development includes the need for agricultural diversification enterprises to sustain the viability of the landholding, and the need for such a facility to attract tourist visitors to the village, which in turn will increase associated economic activities in the area. In recognition of the popularity of Easkey among surfing enthusiasts, it would serve as an affordable facility to accommodate those wishing to stay overnight and would provide an alternative to the informal camping/caravanning that currently takes place along the coast road.

The submission acknowledges access and sewerage deficiencies but states that the public footpath could be extended to the site and that an on-site wastewater treatment system with reed-beds would serve the development.

Opinion

The location identified is situated at the edge of the plan limit and beyond the development limit. As such the lands are located within the proposed 'buffer zone', the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. However, certain forms of development, including 'camping and caravan park' are 'open to consideration' within the 'buffer zone' as highlighted in the Zoning Matrix (chapter 13) accompanying the mini-plans.

The subject site is significantly detached from the village itself and concerns would apply in relation to the absence of appropriate pedestrian links. The absence of sewerage facilities is also noted and the planning authority would have concerns in relation to the proposed on-site treatment including the use of reed-beds.

Notwithstanding these concerns, it would be inappropriate to prescribe a specific zoning to an individual parcel of land that is detached from the development limit. Given that such a proposal would be 'open to consideration' in any case, it is recommended that the site should remain as 'buffer zone' and that the merits, or otherwise, of the proposal would be better assessed through the planning application process. Section 33.6.A of the Easky Mini-plan already supports such tourism-related facilities, subject to appropriate location, standard assessment and compliance with development management criteria.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 135

8 September 2010

Bourke Carrigg & Loftus
on behalf of Raymond Rolston

Issue no. 1

The submission outlines the landowner's objection to the zoning of his lands for any purpose other than agriculture.

Opinion

The lands have been proposed as 'buffer zone' and, as stated in section 13.8.B, such lands are to be reserved principally for agricultural use. This would be in accordance with landowner's preference.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

3. Responses to submissions relating to villages located in the Sligo-Drumcliff Electoral Area

Submissions relating to Ballincar Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant proportion of the submissions received contain requests to zone additional lands for residential development. The vast majority of these lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Ballincar is categorised as a Secondary Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 280 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 235 persons for Ballincar in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 19% compared with a growth rate of 3.1% for the area recorded between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ballincar will be met through a combination of one-off housing and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that approximately 1.54 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Ballincar Mini-Plan including 2.81 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, as well as a significant extent of lands zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). The greenfield 'residential' lands alone would have the potential to provide at least 33 houses which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 75 persons (a 32% increase on the estimated current village population). Accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 15.2 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 182 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of approximately 400 persons (an increase of 170% on the estimated current village population).
- Furthermore, there are currently no public wastewater treatment facilities in Ballincar. Whilst the Rosses Point-Cregg-Ballincar scheme has been included within the DoEHLG programme 2010-2012, advancement of the scheme will be subject to funding. In the absence of such facilities, opportunities for additional residential development will be extremely limited.

Submission no. 14

25 August 2010

Declan McCabe; VHA Architects
on behalf of Rose Colleary

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to circa 8 hectares of land located to the northwest of Ballincar village. The submission requests that the lands be zoned for low density residential development. It is proposed that there would be two access points to these lands, from the south and west.

Opinion

The subject lands alone would have the potential to provide at least 96 houses, thereby accommodating a population increase of 211 persons (almost that of the existing village population). Therefore, as outlined in the Introduction above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of these lands for residential development.

Furthermore, access to the subject lands would be located outside the 50 kph speed limit zone. Accordingly there would be serious concerns in relation to traffic hazard if the subject lands were to be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 20

30 August 2010

Brian Curran, Marian Nealon, Gerard Curran & Dorothy Murphy

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a large plot of land located within the existing built-up area of Ballincar, and supports the designation of these lands for “residential uses”.

Opinion

The subject lands are proposed to be zoned for “residential uses” in accordance with the Draft CDP and Ballincar mini-plan and support for this is noted.

However, it should be noted that the Draft Ballincar mini-plan also identifies lands for ‘mixed uses’ in an effort to establish a defined commercial/village core. A number of submissions (see submissions 34 and 40) have raised concerns about this aspect of the Draft Plan, particularly having regard to the established residential character of the properties affected. Whilst there is no inherent conflict with having residential development in the ‘mixed uses’ area, the planning authority acknowledges the concerns raised in these submissions. Furthermore, it is considered that the achievement of a consolidated village centre area would be difficult given the variety of landowners involved, particularly on the southern side of the R291 where lands are further disjointed by the presence of existing access roads.

As outlined later in submissions 34 and 40, it is therefore considered that the proposed ‘mixed uses’ lands to the south of the R291 should be changed to ‘residential uses’. The objective of creating a co-

ordinated village centre is still warranted however and it is considered that some of the lands referred to in submission no. 20 would be a suitable alternative location. These lands would be considered more suitable as they are undeveloped and have not been disjointed like the lands referred to above. These greenfield lands are located close to the village core and particularly the hotel, and accordingly would be considered an appropriate and convenient location.

It should again be noted that the 'mixed uses' zoning would accommodate 'residential uses' which would appear to be consistent with the intentions of these landowners, and that the majority of the lands referred to in submission no. 20 will still remain zoned 'residential' as requested.

Recommendation

The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as 20a from 'residential uses' to 'mixed uses'.

Submission no. 24

31 August 2010

D. A. Harte & Associates
on behalf of Henry construction

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to a site at the western extremity of Ballincar village. It is stated that these lands are part of a larger site on which planning permission was granted for six houses, four of which have been completed. The submission contends that the site should be included within the development limit of the Ballincar mini-plan in order to allow the completion of the estate and associated services, and to protect the surrounding amenities of the area from the effects of one-off rural housing etc.

Opinion

It is acknowledged that there is a positive planning history on these lands and that they are part of a larger development, the majority of which has been completed along with associated services etc. The planning authority would encourage the full completion of permitted developments in such cases. Furthermore, taken in conjunction with submissions 37 and 48, it is considered that these lands would provide an appropriate consolidation of residential lands. Whilst concerns have been outlined regarding the zoning of additional land for residential development, it should be noted that the lands are minimal in size, would constitute infill development and would only accommodate two houses. Accordingly there is no objection to this request.

Recommendation

The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the development limit to include the lands marked as 24a and by changing the zoning objective for these lands from 'buffer zone' to 'residential uses'.

Submission no. 34

3 September 2010

Colm and Bridie Gannon

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a site located within the village centre of Ballincar, and requests that the site be retained as 'residential' and not for 'mixed uses'. It is stated that the landowners have no intention of carrying out commercial development on the site.

Opinion

The site is proposed to be zoned as 'mixed uses' in accordance with the Draft CDP and Ballincar mini-plan. As outlined in submission no. 20 (above) there is no inherent conflict with residential uses in the 'mixed uses' area but difficulties with the area to the south of the R291 are acknowledged.

Accordingly there is no objection to the proposed zoning of the subject lands for residential uses.

Furthermore it is considered that the same rezoning should apply to all proposed 'mixed uses' lands to the south of the R291.

Recommendation

The **Balincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for all the proposed 'mixed uses' lands to the south of the R291 Regional Road to 'residential uses' (marked as 34a on map 3).

Submission no. 37

3 September 2010

Rory O'Connor & Mary Roche

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to lands located at the western extremity of Ballincar village. The lands are stated to be owned by Mr O'Connor and Ms Roche and currently contain their family home and an adjoining 'gap site' to the east. The submission requests that the lands be zoned residential on the basis of the established uses and patterns of development in the area, along with the planning history of the site.

Opinion

It is acknowledged that the undeveloped site had the benefit of planning permission for the construction of a dwellinghouse under PL 04/1486, which expired on 26/5/10. Furthermore it is acknowledged that the existing dwellinghouse is the only property along the Regional Road R291 that has not been included within the development limit of the Ballincar mini-plan. In the interests of consistency it is considered that the existing house should be zoned residential.

Accordingly there would also be no objection to a residential zoning on the adjoining site to the east as this would constitute minor infill development within an established built-up area. Taken in conjunction with submissions 24 and 48, it is considered that these lands would provide an appropriate consolidation of residential lands. Whilst concerns have been outlined regarding the zoning of additional land for residential development, it should be noted that the lands are minimal in size, would constitute infill development and would only accommodate one additional house. Accordingly there is no objection to this request.

Recommendation

The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as 37a from 'buffer zone' to 'residential uses'. The development limit should also be extended to include these lands.

Submission no. 40

6 September 2010

Ballincar Residents Association

Issue no. 1

The submission contends that the area designated for community facilities (marked as 40.1 on map 1) is in a high visual amenity area and questions the nature and necessity for any such facility. It is stated that there may be a future requirement for an 'Open Sport area / Play area' but any such facility should be cited at a distance from the main road and subject to adequate car parking proposals.

Opinion

This site is essentially surrounded by existing development and is significantly detached from the coastline which is designated as Visually Vulnerable. It is therefore not considered to be a 'high visual amenity area'. Whilst section 17.5.A of the Draft CDP seeks to encourage the development of a multi-purpose community facility at this location, this would not preclude the provision of a range of other community facilities including a sports / play area.

Concerns raised in relation to traffic hazard are noted, particularly given that the site is bounded by roads on three sides. The landowners' objection to the zoning of the site for 'community facilities' (as outlined in submission no. 41) is also noted. There is therefore no objection to changing these lands to 'residential uses' consistent with the details outlined in response to submission no. 34.

However, it is considered important to reserve some land for the provision of facilities that will serve the local community needs. Having reviewed the Plan area it is considered that lands along the northern side of the R291 (to the west of Ballincar Heights, including some of the lands the subject of submission no.118) would be an appropriate alternative location with good access to the R291. The front portion of these lands should therefore be zoned as 'community facilities' with appropriate provision being made for archaeological assessment at planning application stage.

Issue no. 2

Clarification is sought on what exactly is envisaged for the area zoned for residential development to the east of the Radisson Hotel (marked as 40.2 on map 1).

Opinion

The area is zoned for residential uses and therefore it is envisaged that the area will be developed on that basis. Consistent with the general approach to mini-plans, no particular density or layout is prescribed for the site. However, it is located beside the proposed 'open space' site to the north and any development of the site would be required to accommodate the proposed pedestrian linkage as outlined in section 17.1.D. Any such link would most likely be provided at the north-eastern corner of this plot, thereby providing a short link between the 'open space' site and the access road to the east.

Issue no. 3

The submission states that the provision of 'Mains Sewerage' is a priority for the residents of the area and is essential to address the needs of the village and associated health risks in the estuary.

Opinion

The planning authority acknowledges the importance of the provision of wastewater infrastructure and in this regard the area has been included within the Ballincar / Cregg / Rosses Point Main Drainage Scheme (see Table 9.B in section 9.3 of Draft CDP). The scheme has been included on the Water Services Investment Programme 2010-2012 as published by the DoEHLG and Sligo County Council will endeavour to progress this scheme subject to the availability of resources. In the absence of this scheme, development proposals for individual on-site treatment systems will be considered on their merits but multiple unit developments will not be considered as outlined in section 13.9.H of the Draft CDP.

Issue no. 4

The submission contends that Ballincar should be considered together with Rosses Point in relation to the provision of social and commercial services. It is stated that the existing services in Rosses Point should not be duplicated in Ballincar and that the proposed 'mixed uses' area should remain residential.

Opinion

The planning authority recognises that Ballincar is predominantly characterised by residential development and that it relies on the nearby areas of Rosses Point and Sligo City for many social and commercial services. However, as outlined in response to submission no. 20, it is considered that the objective to create a 'mixed use' village core area is still warranted. The aim of this objective is to promote a dynamic mix of uses able to create and sustain viable village centres which serve the needs of the surrounding community in a manner that promotes efficient use of land and energy.

Therefore, the concept of a village centre 'mixed uses' area should be retained subject to the recommended revised location as outlined in response to submissions 20 and 34.

Issue no. 5

It is stated that links between Rosses Point and Ballincar should be strengthened through the provision of cycle tracks and a footpath.

Opinion

As outlined in section 13.3 of the Draft CDP, it is the policy of the planning authority to endeavour to upgrade pedestrian and cycle linkages within all settlements wherever possible. Furthermore, sections 17.3.D and 42.3.G, along with objective O-CW-2 (page 130, Volume1), outline an objective to create a commuter cycling link from Rosses Point to Sligo via Ballincar. However, it is considered that a footpath linking Rosses Point and Ballincar would not be feasible unless developed in conjunction with the design of the proposed cycle link.

Issue no. 6

The submission questions the criteria used in the process of selecting lands for residential zoning. It is stated that there is no objection to some additional development subject to appropriate density and provision of ‘the area sewerage scheme’.

Opinion

The criteria used in the zoning of land for residential development is set out in section 3.4 of the Draft CDP 2011-2017. The vast majority of land zoned for residential development in Ballincar has already been developed. The extent of greenfield land zoned for residential uses has been limited to infill sites between existing development. The aim of this approach is to consolidate the village; to protect the surrounding rural area and associated amenities from urban sprawl; to protect archaeological and nature conservation sites; and to facilitate the economic provision of services and infrastructure.

Some of the greenfield land zoned for residential development is limited to small sites with the potential for one house only. It is estimated that only approximately 2.8 hectares has the potential for more co-ordinated housing development. However, as stated in policy 13.6.H of the Draft CDP, it is the policy of the planning authority that the density of new residential development will be appropriate to the location of the site. Furthermore, as outlined in response to issue 1 (above), multiple unit housing developments will not be considered in the absence of appropriate wastewater infrastructure.

Issue no. 7

It is stated that the ‘proposed path by the seashore’ has generated much discussion and that the community has differing concerns about its appropriateness.

Opinion

This issue is noted. As outlined in section 13.3.C, the route of any such link is indicative only and shall be agreed with developers/applicants during the planning application process.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the site marked as **40a** from ‘community facilities’ to ‘residential uses’.
- B.** The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the site marked as **40b** from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘community facilities’. The development limit should be extended accordingly to include these lands.
- C.** The **Ballincar objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by relocating site CF-1 to the site marked as **40c**.
- D.** **Objective 17.5.A** shall be amended as follows (text deleted in red, text added in blue):
Encourage the development of a multi-purpose community facility facilities on lands marked CF-1, subject to archaeological assessment at planning application stage.

Submission no. 41

6 September 2010

George & Vivien Draper

Issue no. 1

Mr and Mrs Draper are stated to be the owners of a 0.8 acre plot zoned for 'community facilities' in Ballincar. The submission objects to this zoning on the following basis:

- This is a high amenity area and a residential zoning would be preferred;
- Adverse impacts on the privacy of adjoining residences;
- Lack of demand for such facilities;
- Traffic hazard.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 40, it is recommended that the proposed zoning objective for these lands be changed to 'residential uses' as requested.

Issue no. 2

The submission objects to the proposed public walkway along the shore as it would seriously interfere with the privacy of adjoining properties.

Opinion

As outlined in section 13.3.C of the Draft CDP, the route of any such public walkway is indicative only and shall be agreed with developers/applicants during the planning application process. This process will ensure that the privacy of adjoining properties is protected.

Recommendation

No further changes to the Draft CDP are necessary on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 48

7 September 2010

Pat Devaney

The submission relates to lands at the western end of Ballincar and requests a number of alterations to the zoning map of the Ballincar mini-plan.

Issue no. 1

It is requested that the southern portion of Mr Devaney's lands (marked as 48.1 on map 1) be zoned for residential development to accommodate housing for family members.

Opinion

It is noted that the front (western) portion of these lands is located between existing residential properties and would therefore constitute infill development. As outlined in submissions 24 and 37 there would therefore be no objection to the consolidation of small residential plots at this location. However, development of the lands to the rear (east) of this would set an undesirable precedent for

further uncoordinated backland development at this location and should therefore remain as ‘buffer zone’.

Issue no. 2

It is suggested that the northern portion of Mr Devaney’s lands (marked as 48.2 on map 1) be used for the accommodation of a small shop and service station. It is stated that such commercial services are required in Ballincar.

Opinion

Section 17.4 of the Draft Ballincar mini-plan outlines objectives for the creation of a defined commercial village core where land assembly will be encouraged in the interests of co-ordinated development. The subject site is significantly detached from the proposed village core of Ballincar and accordingly is not easily accessible to everyone. It is considered that the proposed development would encourage haphazard piecemeal development of commercial properties and would conflict with objectives to create a centralised and co-ordinated commercial village core. The lands should therefore remain as ‘buffer zone’.

Issue no. 3

It is stated that lands to the west of Mr Devaney’s house (marked as 48.3 on map 1) should be zoned for ‘community facilities’.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 24, it is recommended that these lands be zoned for residential development.

Issue no. 4

The submission confirms that there is no objection to putting a walkway through his lands close to the boundary fences.

Opinion

It is noted that there is no objection to the pedestrian/cycle link as proposed.

Recommendation

The **Ballincar zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the western portion of Mr Devaney’s lands (marked as **48a** on map 3) from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘residential uses’. The development limit should be extended accordingly to include these lands.

Adrian Tansey

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that an area of land on the northern fringe of the development limit of Ballincar be zoned for residential use. It is stated that this would provide a site for a one-off house which will be for family occupation. It is stated that the site is located adjacent to existing residential development; would consolidate the settlement pattern; will not be visually obtrusive; will not extend the linear pattern of the village; is serviced by an existing access road; is inside the speed limit; and is within walking distance of public transport. The submission also states that the lands are not within the constraints zone of the nearby national monument and that the site has previously had the benefit of planning permission under planning reference PL12045 which was granted in 1982.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' above, there are serious concerns regarding the zoning of additional land for residential development in Ballincar. Whilst justification can be made for small infill sites which would merely facilitate the consolidation of residential lands, there are concerns regarding sites on the fringe of the development limit that would set an undesirable precedent for the further extension of 'ribbon-type' residential development into the 'buffer zone'.

The lands referred to are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the 'buffer zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. However, the zoning of the land as 'buffer zone' does not preclude the provision of one-off housing development subject to the establishment of genuine rural-generated housing need (as outlined in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1) and compliance with all other standard development management criteria.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, together with the potential for accommodating one-off housing in the 'buffer zone', the site should not be zoned for 'residential uses'.

Issue no. 2

The submission states that Sligo County Council should adopt a sympathetic approach toward development in existing settlements which is proposed to be connected to the Sligo Main Drainage Scheme, but as yet remains unconnected, through the facilitation of temporary on-site treatment or temporary communal systems.

Opinion

In relation to the intended future connection of a settlement to the Sligo Main Drainage scheme, the response to submission no. 40 (above) already outlines that applications for individual on-site systems will be assessed on their merits. However, the provision of communal treatment systems will not be permitted due to management, maintenance and operational concerns. The future availability of connection to the Sligo Main Drainage scheme is not considered a viable reason to deviate from this policy position. The only exception to this would be where work has already commenced on the provision/upgrading of public wastewater facilities, as already outlined under section 13.9.E of the Draft CDP.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 67

8 September 2010

Lilian Boyle, Marie & Jerome Dufficy, Margaret Kilmartin,
Mary Colgan, Sean & Deirdre Gallagher

It would appear that the submission is made on behalf of the owners of the five houses directly east of the Radisson Hotel.

Issue no. 1

The submission raises concern that there is no evidence of any sewerage plan in the Ballincar zoning map. In particular, concerns are raised regarding development of the lands to the north and south of these five houses in the absence of a mains sewerage system. It is stated that these lands should not be zoned for residential use until the area is serviced with a sewerage system.

Opinion

The mini-plan is primarily concerned with land-use matters and accordingly does not go into the detail of showing any proposed wastewater drainage networks. In terms of wastewater treatment, the Ballincar area will be served by the Rosses Point/Cregg/Ballincar project which will involve the pumping of wastewater into the Sligo Main Drainage scheme. The main land use consideration in this regard is the reservation of land for the provision of a pumping station and this has been shown on both the zoning map and objectives map (at the extreme western limit of the Plan).

As outlined in response to submission no. 40 (above), applications for individual on-site systems will be assessed on their merits but multiple housing developments will not be permitted in the absence of the availability of connection to the proposed public wastewater system.

The zoning of land for residential development is necessary in order to provide certainty regarding the future growth of the village. Any future development proposal on such lands would only be permitted however subject to the availability of satisfactory wastewater disposal proposals. Therefore, despite the lack of such infrastructure at present, there is no justification for altering proposals for the zoning of a reasonable amount land on this basis.

Issue no. 2

The submission requests that any development of the lands to the north of these five houses should incorporate an access road to the rear of their properties.

Opinion

These five properties are already served to the south by an access road which runs parallel to the Sligo – Rosses Point road. It is not considered necessary that any future development of lands to the north of these properties should incorporate an additional access road to the rear.

Issue no. 3

The submission requests that when the mains sewerage system is being developed, access to it shall be provided at the rear of their properties in order to ensure ease of access.

Opinion

The issue of connections to any future wastewater network is an operational matter which should not be dealt with in the CDP or any mini-plans included therein. This should be dealt with in consultation with the Water Services section of Sligo County Council.

Issue no. 4

The submission requests that the individuals involved receive a copy of the final Plan.

Opinion

Public notification procedures will be followed by Sligo County Council when the final CDP is adopted. This will inform the public of the availability of the CDP for inspection and/or purchase.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 103

8 September 2010

M. Healy

Issue no. 1

The submission gives a qualified welcome to the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan and agrees that a lack of infrastructure should continue to be reason for deferring further residential development in the village. The submission welcomes proposals to provide community facilities, coastal walks and cycle lanes. In addition, the submission supports the approach in the Plan which seeks to protect the archaeological heritage of the area.

Opinion

Support for these aspects of the Draft Plan is noted.

Issue No. 2

The submission makes a number of suggestions for inclusion in the Plan as follows:

- a) that the 'village' be extended westwards to the point where the road meets the coast;
- b) to protect a right of way to the coast at Cregg Cross;
- c) to extend traffic calming westward beyond Sea Park;
- d) that the proposed coastal walk should be along the high tide and should extend further westward to the point where the road meets the coast and avail of existing rights of way;

- e) the provision of another river walk along the Teesan stream to complete a circular walk/jogging track;
- f) consideration to the provision of a facility on the coast to launch small boats (at the west end of the village);
- g) that the lands along the Teesan stream be zoned for sports/recreation purposes having regard to the previous use of the site. The existence of a former mill pond is also noted with a suggestion that the existing dam could be refurbished to provide a lake/pond for amenity purposes.

Opinion

The response to the various issues raised is as follows:

- a) It is not considered appropriate to extend the development limit or plan limit in a western direction given the need to consolidate development within the village core. This policy will assist in the development of a compact settlement where new development is located in close proximity to existing and proposed services.
- b) The Draft CDP does not establish or protect any rights of way. If a right of way exists at the indicated location it will continue to exist regardless of whether it is indicated or not. However, it is an objective of the Draft CDP (O-TOU-4, page 64, Volume 1) to commence the process of mapping rights of way during the lifetime of the Plan. This issue will be dealt with at this stage.
- c) The existing traffic calming at its western end is located at the optimum location for its effect. A longer stretch would negate the purpose of the traffic calming.
- d) The proposed walks located in the vicinity of the shore are indicative in nature and would be developed in agreement with landowners and/or developers. If developed, any such walkway would avail of any existing Rights of Way. Whilst any such walkway could, in practice, extend further westward, it would not be necessary to extend the Plan area in order to accommodate this.
- e) There is considerable merit in establishing a circular walking/jogging track around the settlement and the proposed route could contribute to the achievement of same. There is therefore no objection to this proposal.
- f) The proposed location of this facility is outside the Plan area. In any case, the Draft CDP is not considered an appropriate method of identifying the suitability of any such facility, which would be located within the Cummeen Strand/Druncliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC/pNHA and Cummeen Strand SPA. Any such proposal would be subject to the Habitats Directive Assessment process and would be better dealt with as a planning application.
- g) The lands along the Teesan stream are zoned as 'buffer zone' and any sports/recreation/amenity facility would be 'open to consideration' within this zoning category. There is therefore no need to rezone lands at this location.

Recommendations

- A. The **Ballincar objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by including an additional walkway / cycleway along the Teesan stream (marked as recommended amendment **103a**).
- B. The wording of b should be amended as follows:

Encourage the provision of a walkway/cycleway circuit around the village through the provision of pedestrian links between the village, Teesan stream and the sea shore (as indicated on the Objectives Map) and require the provision of such links in conjunction with the development of adjoining lands.

Gary McGinty
on behalf of Ray & Eileen Monaghan

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the development limit be extended to include an area of land which is currently proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’. The submission recommends that the southern portion of the land (marked as 117.1 on map 1) be zoned for residential use to provide a site for a one-off house which will be for family occupation.

It is argued that the site is located adjacent to existing residential development and will not be visually obtrusive having specific regard to the topography of the surrounding lands.

Opinion

As outlined in the ‘introduction’ above, there are serious concerns regarding the zoning of additional land for residential development in Ballincar. Whilst justification can be made for infill sites which would merely facilitate the consolidation of residential lands, there are concerns regarding sites on the fringe of the development limit that would set an undesirable precedent for the further residential development into the ‘buffer zone’.

The aim of the ‘buffer zone’ is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. However, the zoning of the land as ‘buffer zone’ does not preclude the provision of one-off housing development subject to the establishment of genuine rural-generated housing need (as outlined in response to Submission no. 114 in Volume 1) and compliance with all other standard development management criteria.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, together with the potential for accommodating one-off housing in the ‘buffer zone’, the site should not be zoned for ‘residential uses’. This is the case particularly given that these lands (at approximately 1 hectare) are significantly larger than is required for one house and may therefore offer the potential for further residential development.

Issue no. 2

The submission requests that the northern portion of these lands (marked as 117.2 on map 1) be zoned as ‘open space’ whilst retaining access to the southern portion of the lands, thereby facilitating the objective in the Mini-Plan relating to pedestrian access to the coastline.

Opinion

There is no requirement to zone the northern portion of these lands for ‘open space’ as any such proposal would be accommodated in principle in the ‘buffer zone’.

Issue no. 3

The submission recommends that the western speed limit in Ballincar village be relocated to a point 100m west of the Cregg Road junction. The submission argues that it is inappropriate that 35 houses within the village access the Regional Road at a location where the 80kmph speed limit applies and that the proposed relocation of the limit would result in an improvement in traffic safety at this location.

Opinion

The traffic calming at its western end, which marks the end of the 50kph zone, is located at the optimum location for its effect. A longer stretch would negate the purpose of the traffic calming. Furthermore, the consideration of the location of individual speed limit restrictions within the county is not a matter for the County Development Plan.

Issue No. 4

The submission recommends that the designation of the coastline to the south of Ballincar as “visually vulnerable” be omitted from the Draft CDP.

Opinion

As outlined in section 7.4.3 of the Draft CDP, the term “visually vulnerable area” refers to distinctive and conspicuous natural features of significant natural beauty or interest, which have extremely low capacity to absorb new development. Whilst the coastal area of Ballincar has experienced some development, the above description still applies to the majority of the coastline. The “visually vulnerable” designation refers to the entire coastline of the county and it is not considered appropriate to omit a small section from this on the basis of some existing development in the vicinity of the coastline.

Issue No. 5

The submission recommends that where there is a conflict between the provisions of the Draft County Development Plan and the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan it should be explicitly stated that the provisions of the Ballincar Mini-Plan will be given precedence.

Opinion

The Draft Ballincar mini-plan is part of the Draft CDP and the zonings contained within the mini-plan were informed by the overall county-wide designations contained within the Draft CDP. It is therefore considered that no inherent conflict exists between the provisions of the Ballincar Mini-Plan and those contained within the Draft CDP, and in this context there is no requirement for a statement in respect of the precedence of the Mini-Plan over the CDP.

Issue No. 6

The submission recommends that objective 17.1.C relating to the restriction of development between the development limit and the coastline be omitted. Alternatively it is recommended that this policy should be amended to allow for local housing needs etc. The submission also questions whether this policy would apply to agricultural development which would normally be exempt.

Opinion

Objective 17.1.C states that the lands between the development limit of Ballincar and the coastline should “generally” be retained free from development and does not constitute a complete ban on development. Whilst it is not possible to outline all the criteria under which development may be permitted, the provision of a house for rural-generated housing need would be open to consideration in accordance with details outlined in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1.

In relation to normally exempted developments, it should be noted that any such proposal would be subject to assessment in accordance with section 5 of the Planning and Development (Amendment) Act 2010. It is considered that, depending on the location and scale of a particular proposal, objective 17.1.C could constitute a restriction on exemption in accordance with Article 9 (1) (vi) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2010. It should be noted however, that the existing ‘visually vulnerable area’ designation along the coastline essentially imposes the same restrictions already.

Issue No. 7

This issue relates to the Draft County Development Plan as a whole and recommends that specific reference toward “sympathetic consideration for sons and daughters of landholders should they wish to erect a dwelling house on family lands” be inserted into the CDP.

Opinion

The issue of rural housing policy is addressed in the response to submission no. 114 and it is considered that the recommended amendments in this regard adequately cover this issue.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 118

8 September 2010

Gary McGinty

on behalf of Seamus & Patricia O’Dowd

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that an area of land on the northern fringe of the development limit of Ballincar which is currently proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ be included within the development limit of the village.

The submission recommends that the north-western portion of these lands (marked as 118.1 on map 1) be zoned for residential uses. The submission argues that the lands referred to represent “the only logical and sustainable expansion” of the village, would help to consolidate the village core, and thereby ensure the sustainability and viability of potential services and facilities in the village. The submission goes on to argue that the zoning of the lands for residential uses will not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area, will facilitate access to adjoining lands thereby ensuring a “more coordinated approach” to the development of the village.

The submission also argues that there is a significant demand for housing in the Ballincar area stating that the lack of a statutory plan and a lack of services have continually frustrated any proposals for development (an opinion from a local auctioneer in respect of the demand for housing is appended).

Opinion

As outlined in the ‘introduction’ above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development. The proposed residential zoning of 4.3 hectares would have the potential to provide at least 51 houses which would accommodate a further 113 persons (approximately 50% of the current village population). This would constitute a significant additional zoning which would raise the potential population of Ballincar significantly in excess of the recommended population level of 280 persons. Whilst demand for housing in the area is noted, it is

considered that the Draft mini-plan provides adequate opportunity to accommodate projected growth during the plan period.

The lands referred to are proposed to be zoned as buffer zone in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. In this context it is particularly notable that the majority of lands referred to in the submission are within a Zone of Archaeological Potential as designated in the Record of Monuments and Places. It is therefore considered inappropriate that these lands be developed for a large scale housing development such as that which is proposed.

However, as indicated in response to submission no. 40, the southern portion of these lands would be considered suitable for zoning as 'community facilities' subject to archaeological assessment at planning application stage.

Issue no. 2

The submission recommends that the south-eastern portion of these lands (marked as 118.2 on map 1) be zoned as open space and states that the proposed linear open space would be of benefit to the village allowing for the provision of walkways, cycleways and green linkages to nearby amenities.

Opinion

There is no requirement to zone any portion of these lands for 'open space' as any such proposal would be accommodated in principle in the 'buffer zone'.

However, as indicated in response to submission no. 40, the southern portion of these lands would be considered suitable for zoning as 'community facilities' subject to archaeological assessment at planning application stage.

Issue no. 3

The submission recommends that the western speed limit in Ballincar village be relocated to a point 100m west of the Cregg Road junction. The submission argues that it is inappropriate that 35 houses within the village access the Regional Road at a location where the 80kmph speed limit applies and that the proposed relocation of the limit would result in an improvement in traffic safety at this location.

Opinion

The traffic calming at its western end, which marks the end of the 50kph zone, is located at the optimum location for its effect. A longer stretch would negate the purpose of the traffic calming. Furthermore, the consideration of the location of individual speed limit restrictions within the county is not a matter for the County Development Plan.

Issue No. 4

The submission recommends that where there is a conflict between the provisions of the Draft County Development Plan and the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan it should be explicitly stated that the provisions of the Ballincar Mini-Plan will be given precedence.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 117, it is not considered that any inherent conflict exists and therefore a statement of precedence is not required.

Issue No. 5

The submission recommends that a specific objective should be included on the water supply and wastewater treatment section of the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan regarding the provision small scale Packaged treatment systems to facilitate the provision of temporary sewerage facilities in the absence of the proposed public facility. The submission argues that the complete ban on communal effluent treatment systems is unsustainable in terms of the development of the village and should be removed. The submission argues that such provisions would allow for the development of the village thereby alleviating the development pressure in surrounding rural areas and ensuring the viability of local services and facilities.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 62, communal effluent treatment systems will not be permitted due to serious concerns regarding their management, maintenance and operation.

Issue No. 6

The submission argues that Table 3R – Secondary Gateway Satellites, as contained in Chapter 3 of the Draft CDP, should be amended to provide for a recommended population level of 380 for Ballincar by 2017. The submission argues that the proposed population target of 280 is totally unsustainable allowing only for an increase of 45 in the population of the village. The submission argues that the proposed population increase can be justified by the availability of suitable land for development, the unique location of the village within cycling distance of Sligo, and the need to ensure the viability of services and facilities including public transport.

Opinion

Table 3R – Secondary Gateway Satellites, as contained in Chapter 3 of the Draft CDP, has been formulated based on the Core Strategy of the Draft CDP which in turn must be compliant with national and regional population projections. The population allocations for the county have then been distributed to each settlement in an appropriate manner with a view toward the management of sustainable development patterns throughout the county.

It should be noted that, according to census data, the population of the Ballincar area grew by approximately 3% between 2002 and 2006. The proposed population increase for Ballincar of 45 persons allows for an approximate increase of 19% over the lifetime of the CDP (2011-2017). This would allow for a significant increase in the rate of population growth and accordingly is considered adequate.

Issue No. 7

This issue relates to the Draft County Development Plan as a whole and recommends that specific reference toward “sympathetic consideration for sons and daughters of landholders should they wish to erect a dwelling house on family lands” be inserted into the CDP.

Opinion

The issue of rural housing policy is dealt with in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1 and it is considered that the recommended amendments in this regard adequately cover this issue.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Carney Mini-Plan

Introduction

Both submissions received are essentially requests to zone additional lands for residential development. All of the lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Carney is categorised as a Secondary Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 400 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 306 persons for Carney in 2010. The recommended population level therefore represents a growth rate of 30% compared to a rate of 25% experienced in the wider Carney area between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Carney will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are 16 vacant residential units in the village with the potential to accommodate approximately 35 persons, and accordingly that approximately 2.23 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential requirements during the plan period.
- This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Carney Mini-Plan including 11.429 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 5.3 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands have the potential to provide at least 178 houses and accommodate approximately 393 persons.
- The Draft mini-plan therefore already provides for a potential population increase of approximately 430 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which would represent a 140% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for a total of approximately 200 residential units.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 6.3 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 75 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 166 persons. This would further raise the potential population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Liam & Patricia Devins

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a plot of land (stated to be 2.1 hectares) located to the south of the Coolbeg road and requests that the plot retains its residential zoning in the Carney Mini-Plan. The reason for this request is stated to be for the accommodation of family members' housing needs. The submission contends that the development of the site would be in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and that the land is adequately serviced. It is also stated that this would not result in extending development further along this road and that any development could be accommodated in terms of traffic safety and speed limits etc.

The submission requests that the site be zoned 'medium-high density' residential development. In the event of this request being unsuccessful, the submission requests that the planning authority consider low-medium residential density or alternatively consider a residential zoning for the northern field only.

Opinion

Not all of these lands are zoned residential in the current CDP as the southern extremity of the land (to the west of the archaeological monument) is zoned as 'buffer zone'. Furthermore, the lands are zoned for 'residential uses' only, without any prescribed density.

In the Draft CDP the proposed zoning of these lands was changed from 'residential uses' to 'buffer zone'. The aim of the 'buffer zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. Similar to many other plots of land in the County, this rezoning was proposed due to the oversupply of zoned land, the extent of vacant housing in the area, and the need to be compliant with the recommended population levels. As outlined in the 'introduction' above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential uses.

Furthermore, given that the intentions in this regard are for the accommodation of family members, it should be noted that proposals for the accommodation of rural-generated housing needs are facilitated within the 'buffer zone' subject to compliance with the details outlined in response to Submission 114 (in Volume 1) and all other standard development management criteria.

Notwithstanding the stated intentions to accommodate family members, the subject lands extend to 2.1 hectares and would have the potential to provide 25 additional houses, which would accommodate approximately 55 persons.

It is noted that a significant portion of these lands is covered by an archaeological monument and therefore there would be concerns regarding potential impacts in this regard. The lands also bound onto a designated Special Protection Area (SPA) and are close to the adjoining Natural Heritage Area (NHA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). There would therefore be concerns given the need to protect such sites and the related objectives contained within the Draft CDP.

The subject lands are located outside the 50 km/hr speed limit zone and there is no public footpath or public lighting linking the lands to the village centre. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety if the subject lands were to be zoned for residential uses.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses, particularly given that rural-generated family housing needs can be accommodated within the buffer zone.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 99

8 September 2010

Haran & Associates
on behalf of John Feeney

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the proposed zoning of a portion of land to the west of Carney be amended from 'buffer zone' to low-density residential uses. The submission argues that the lands are in close proximity to the village core, will not result in visual intrusion, and are not located along a designated scenic route. It is also stated that they do not contain any protected structures or sites of geological interest. The submission goes on to argue that the lands in question are of a good quality, are highly suitable for construction and can be directly accessed from the existing road network.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential uses having regard to the extent of lands already zoned and residential vacancy rates. The subject lands extend to 4.2 hectares and would have the potential to provide an additional 50 houses, which would accommodate approximately 110 persons.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP and are significantly detached from the development limit of the draft Carney mini-plan. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location which would conflict with the principle of sequential development as outlined in section 3.4.1 of the Draft CDP.

It should be noted that a significant (northern) portion of the lands referred to in this submission are within the Zone of Archaeological Potential of a monument listed on the Record of Monuments and Places. This would constitute a significant constraint to the development of these lands.

The lands also bound onto a designated Special Protection Area (SPA) and are close to the adjoining Natural Heritage Area (NHA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). There would therefore be concerns given the need to protect such sites and the related objectives contained within the Draft CDP.

There is no public footpath or public lighting linking the lands to the village centre. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety if the subject lands were to be zoned for residential uses.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Cliffony Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant feature of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development. The vast majority of lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Cliffony is categorised as a 'village supporting the rural community' and has a recommended population level of 500 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 447 persons for Cliffony in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a significant growth rate of 11.8%, compared to an exceptionally high rate of 30% experienced between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Cliffony will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there were 20 vacant residential units in the village with the potential to accommodate approximately 44 persons. Accordingly just approximately 0.34 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period.
- This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Cliffony Mini-Plan including 0.73 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 1.3 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 18 additional houses which would accommodate a further population of approximately 42 persons.
- The Draft mini-plan already provides for a potential population increase of 86 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which would represent a 19% increase on the estimated current village population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for 12 residential units. These units alone would meet the new residential requirements during the plan period.
- The wastewater treatment system in the village has a design capacity of 450PE (population equivalent) and is currently overloaded. Whilst a new treatment works is proposed, progression of this scheme will be subject to funding and other resource requirements.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 4.7 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 56 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 124 persons (i.e. 27% of the current village population). This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 63

7 September 2010

Martin A. & Mary B. Timoney

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to alleged mapping discrepancies in the Cliffony Mini-Plan. These relate to an ownership division on a piece of zoned land at the north western extremity of the zoned area and to the representation of the access road to the wastewater treatment plant.

Opinion

The mapping presented in the Cliffony Mini-Plan is based on Ordinance Survey issue maps and is a representation of existing physical boundaries and features. The zoning and objectives maps as presented do not depict the ownership of individual sites nor do they imply any such ownership.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 64

7 September 2010

Martin A. & Mary B. Timoney

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to a portion of land to the north of Cliffony village which is proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' and requests that it be included within the development limit "for the possibility of development at some time in the future" for residential purposes. The submission refers to a number of previous planning applications and the associated discussions with the Planning Authority relating to the overall landholding.

The submission argues that the development of the lands will not result in negative impacts on visual amenities, particularly on views from the R279 Cliffony to Mullaghmore road, due to local topography. It is also argued that the lands referred to are the only serviced or easily serviceable lands within the village. Given the landowners proposal to provide serviced sites it is stated that the phased development of the lands would provide a choice of house type and allow for the future development of Cliffony in the medium term, thereby addressing the perceived inadequacy in the range of house types available within the village. The submission acknowledges the existing deficiency in services, welcomes proposals to upgrade the existing wastewater treatment plant and argues that the development charges accruing from proposed development would help to finance same.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential uses having regard to the extent of land already proposed to be zoned and existing residential vacancy levels. The subject lands extend to 3.5 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 42 additional houses, which would accommodate approximately 92 additional persons.

These lands are zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP, the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further urban sprawl throughout the plan area.

The lands are also located close to the adjoining Natural Heritage Area (NHA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). There would therefore be concerns given the need to protect such sites and the related objectives contained within the Draft CDP. The lands are very exposed when viewed from the coastal area to the north and west and there would be visual amenity concerns in relation to urban sprawl in this direction, particularly given that large areas are designated as Sensitive Rural Landscape and Visually Vulnerable.

There is no public footpath or public lighting linking the lands to the village centre. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety if the subject lands were to be zoned for residential uses.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 122

8 September 2010

Martin McGloin

on behalf of Liam McHugh, McHugh & Gallagher

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to lands located to the southeast of Cliffony village and notes the proposed zoning of the lands as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. The submission requests that these lands be included within the development limit and that their zoning be amended to 'residential uses'. The submission states that the lands in question were purchased as development land and were the subject of previous successful planning applications which have now expired. The submission argues that the site has easy access to the public road and public sewer.

The submission makes reference to the statement in the Draft Mini-Plan that the residential requirements of Cliffony will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development which is currently under construction. It is argued that many of the properties referred to have been occupied and/or purchased since the Planning Authorities survey of Cliffony. Furthermore, it is argued that the range of house types available in Cliffony is not suitable for the ongoing development of the village, with a lack of family-suitable larger dwelling houses.

The submission suggests that the lands could be developed as individual serviced sites for the provision of detached dwelling houses on a low-density basis which would be suitable for family occupation, thereby addressing the perceived inadequacy in the range of house types available within the village. The provision of a "reasonable green play area" is also referred to. It is argued that the provision of such sites within the village setting would reduce the pressure for greenfield sites in the locality.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential uses having regard to the extent of land already proposed to be zoned and existing residential vacancy levels. The subject lands extend to 1.2 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 14 additional houses, which would accommodate approximately 32 additional persons.

These lands are zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP, the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further urban sprawl throughout the plan area.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there previous planning permission on these lands, it should be noted that they were for smaller portions of the site, for a limited number of houses, and relate to planning applications submitted more than 10 years ago. The most relevant application for these lands is PL 02/97, an application for 28 houses which was refused.

In relation to the rate of residential vacancy in Cliffoney, it should be noted that 2010 surveys carried out by SCC in response to figures provided by the DoEHLG would still indicate that there are at least 21 residential properties that are either vacant or under construction in Cliffoney. It is acknowledged that a number of properties were sold during the year and indeed it is considered that this is evidence to the contrary of the submission's contention that the existing type of housing stock does not meet requirements appropriately.

Accordingly it is considered that the Draft CDP adequately provides for the housing requirements of the village, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, and the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 123

8 September 2010

Martin McGloin

on behalf of Liam McHugh, McHugh & Gallagher

Issue no. 1

The submission requests the rezoning of a piece of land which is located to the north and west of Cliffony Hall from a combination of 'residential uses' and 'community uses' to 'mixed uses'. The submission questions the zoning of the lands to the southwest of Cliffony Hall as 'community facilities' and points out that the community do not own these lands.

It is requested that the Planning Authority re-examine the zoning of these lands and it is suggested that the lands in question would be more appropriately zoned for 'mixed uses' which would provide more flexible development potential in this area.

Opinion

A portion of these lands was proposed to be zoned for 'community facilities' in order to accommodate the potential expansion of the existing community lands at this location, irrespective of land ownership. However, it is noted that any such community facility would also be acceptable within the 'mixed uses' zoning category and therefore there is no objection on this basis.

Furthermore it is considered that, if the proposed 'mixed use' zoning was extended to encompass the existing site of the community hall, such a zoning would provide greater flexibility in the development of this important corner site and would be more consistent with the majority of surrounding sites along the N15. The zoning would facilitate community uses whilst also providing for other potential

commercial uses, thereby providing a potential engine for the redevelopment or relocation of the community hall site if the community wish to do so in the future.

Accordingly there is no objection to the requesting zoning and it is further recommended that this 'mixed use' zoning should be extended to include the site of the community hall.

Recommendation

The **Zoning map** of the Cliffony Mini-Plan should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands annotated as **123a** from a combination of 'community uses' and 'residential uses' to 'mixed uses' in their entirety.

Submissions relating to Drumcliff Mini-Plan

Submission no. 47

7 September 2010

Christy Conway

Issue no. 1

The submission promotes the potential of Drumcliff to develop as Sligo's flagship tourist attraction in conjunction with the development of a major visitors centre and the development of the N15 National Road route realignment. The various attractions and advantages for the area are outlined in the submission.

The submission refers to a site for this development adjacent to Drumcliffe Church, graveyard and existing parking area. It is stated that a major building would house information and evidence of the historical and cultural attractions of the area, and would be designed to capitalise upon the surrounding scenery. Gardens would also be provided for visitors' walkways, which could be linked to the proposed riverside walkways.

It is stated that provision for the extension of the graveyard and car-park would also be accommodated within this plan.

Opinion

The Draft Drumcliff mini-plan acknowledges the potential to develop the Drumcliffe area as a tourism base for the County and section 32.6 of the Draft CDP outlines objectives which support this view. However, given the visual, archaeological and historical sensitivities of the area it is considered that the location and scale of any such facility would be of critical importance.

In archaeological terms it is known that the extent of the monastic enclosure at Drumcliff is extensive and is greater than that provided for in the Record of Monuments and Places. However, the exact extent of the enclosure needs to be established and perhaps this could be undertaken in conjunction with future investigations required for the next phase of planning for the N15. Further development within the monastic enclosure should be strictly controlled so that its integrity and the integrity of the broader cultural grouping at the site are preserved.

Drumcliff is one of a number of significant heritage sites within County Sligo that would benefit from improved presentation and interpretation. This function could be delivered in the future through the provision of a county museum, which would signpost visitors to sites around the county. The provision of improved access and tourism facilities at Drumcliff would be encouraged. However, the siting and location of any such proposed services would need to be carefully considered and done in consultation with the National Monuments Service of the DoEHLG and the OPW.

The submission also proposes that an extension of the graveyard and car park at Drumcliff could be accommodated in this plan. The DoEHLG guideline in relation to extensions to historic graveyards is that any extension should be at least 100 metres from the existing graveyard. The existing graveyard at Drumcliff lies within the monastic enclosure and any future new graveyard provision should be located outside of the enclosure and should not impact negatively on the setting of the site. For the same reasons, any proposed car park extensions should be located outside the monastic enclosure and should not impact negatively on the setting of the site.

However, it should be noted that both a community facility (such as a burial ground) and a car park are both developments that are 'open to consideration' within the 'buffer zone' as outlined in the zoning

matrix (chapter 13 of the Draft CDP). There is therefore no requirement to zone lands for the purpose of accommodating such facilities as the lands are already zoned as ‘buffer zone’. It should be noted however that any such proposal would be subject to extensive archaeological assessment.

The outstanding aspect of this submission is therefore that of the ‘major building’ and associated tourism facilities. It is acknowledged that the intentions of submission are commendable in terms of its potential contribution to cultural appreciation and tourism development. However, having regard to the area outlined in this submission, together with the description of the proposal, it would appear that the scale of the proposed development would be excessive and inappropriate for this visually and archaeologically sensitive area. It is considered that an appropriately scaled tourism facility could be accommodated on the lands currently zoned for ‘tourism related uses’ in the Draft CDP subject to appropriate archaeological and other standard assessments. This is therefore considered sufficient and there is no requirement to zone additional land for ‘tourism related uses’.

In relation to the N15 realignment it should be noted that this scheme is nearing completion of Phase 4 of the NRA Project Management Guidelines - Preliminary Design. Once this phase is closed out the next stage is to publish the CPO/EIS for the scheme for which Sligo County Council will require funding from the NRA. The NRA has given no commitment as to when this funding will be made available.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 56

7 September 2010

Reverend Ian Linton, Rector

Issue no. 1

The first issue in the submission relates to a site in Drumcliff which is located outside the proposed development limit adjacent to St. Columba’s Church. The submission requests that this area (annotated as 56.1 on map 1) be zoned for the purpose of “community facilities” in order to facilitate the extension of the existing burial grounds at this location.

Opinion

It should be noted that the site is located within part of the area outlined under submission no. 47 and involves similar intentions for use. As outlined in response to submission no 47, there are serious concerns in relation to the sensitivity of this area. Again however, given that the proposed use (i.e. burial ground) would constitute a community facility, it would be ‘open to consideration’ in the ‘buffer zone’. There is therefore no requirement to zone these lands for ‘community facilities’.

Issue no. 2

The second issue raised relates to a portion of land adjacent to the car park which serves St. Columba’s Church and the adjacent attractions. The submission requests that this area (annotated as 56.2 on map 1) be zoned for the purpose of “community facilities” in order to facilitate the provision of a community hall at this location.

Opinion

It should be noted that the site is located within part of the area outlined under submission no. 47. As outlined in response to submission no 47, there are serious concerns in relation to the sensitivity of this area. Again however, given that the proposed use (i.e. community hall) would constitute a community facility, it would be 'open to consideration' in the 'buffer zone'. There is therefore no requirement to zone these lands for 'community facilities'.

Issue no. 3

The third issue relates to Ahamlish Church which is located approximately 2km northeast of Grange village in close proximity to the N15 Sligo to Donegal National Primary Route. The submission requests the removal of Ahamlish Church from the Record of Protected Structures for County Sligo as contained in the Draft Sligo County Development Plan 2011-2017. The submission contends that the building is in an extremely poor state of repair, poses a threat to passers-by and is of no significant heritage value.

Opinion

As this issue relates to the RPS, please refer to Volume 3 of the Manager's Report for opinion and recommendation in this regard.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of issues 1 and 2 raised in this submission.

Submission no. 91

8 September 2010

Anthony Gallagher, Architect
on behalf of Terry Gannon & Des Butler

The first three issues of this submission are addressed in Volume 1 of this Report.

Issue no. 3

The submission welcomes the flexible and supportive approach adopted in the Drumcliff mini-plan towards the provision of community facilities on suitable sites, but states that this is contradicted by policy statements contained in section 6.1 of the Draft CDP. The main thrust of this argument has already been outlined and addressed in Volume 1 of this report.

Opinion

As outlined in the response to submission no. 91, as contained in Volume 1, it is considered that suitable flexibility already exists in relation to the provision of community facilities, and that there is no inherent conflict between the Drumcliff mini-plan and the community facilities policies outlined in section 6.1 of the Draft CDP.

Issue no. 4

The submission states that the “limited spare capacity” of the public wastewater treatment facility in Drumcliff can only inhibit growth and that remedial works should be implemented as soon as is practical.

Opinion

The current wastewater facility has a design capacity of 150PE (Population Equivalent). With an estimated current loading of 95PE there is a spare capacity of approximately 55PE. As outlined in Table 9.B of the Draft CDP, a review of this scheme is to be completed and this will be progressed subject to priorities and the availability of funding/resources.

Issue no. 5

It is recommended that the 40km speed limit should be extended to within a radius of 1km of Drumcliff.

Opinion

The standard speed limit between traffic calming gates is 50kph. The speed limit within the traffic calming areas of Drumcliffe and Rathcormac is 50kph. The 50km speed limit in Drumcliffe currently extends to a point approximately 800m north of the Church. It is currently proposed that the speed limit between the two traffic calmed villages, Drumcliffe and Rathcormac, be reduced from 100kph to 60kph.

This would ultimately result in a stretch of approximately 2.5km with a reduced speed limit at this location which is considered adequate. Notwithstanding this, changes to speed limits are an issue that should be considered outside of the Development Plan process.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft Plan is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Grange Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant feature of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development. The vast majority of lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'Buffer Zone' in the Draft Plan. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Grange is categorised as a 'Principal Gateway Satellite' and has a recommended population level of 600 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 493 persons for Grange in 2010. This recommended population level would represent a growth rate of 21.7% compared to a rate of 4.6% experienced throughout the County between the years 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Grange will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that there are 24 vacant residential units in the village which would have the capacity to accommodate a further 53 persons. Accordingly, approximately 2.05 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period.
- This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Grange Mini-Plan including 6.12 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 3.3 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands have the potential to provide at least 100 residential units which would accommodate a further population of approximately 220 persons.
- Therefore the Draft mini-plan already accommodates a potential population increase of 273 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant housing and zoned lands), which would represent a 55% increase on the existing village population.
- Of the lands zoned in the Draft mini-plan, it should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for 46 residential units.
- The wastewater treatment system in the village has a design capacity of just 280PE (population equivalent) and is currently significantly overloaded. Whilst there are plans to provide a new plant with increased capacity, progression of this scheme will be subject to the availability of funding and resources.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of approximately 12 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 144 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 316 persons (64% of the current population). This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. E-1

11 February 2010

Barry McSweeney

This submission should be read in conjunction with submission no's. E-2 and 5.

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to lands at Aughagad and would appear to be consistent with the lands the subject of submission no.'s E-2 and 5. The submission contends that these lands should not be rezoned for use as a school, cemetery and playing fields, and puts forward reasons for this as follows:

- Community facilities should be located within settlements and in order to avoid urban sprawl;
- Access to the site is substandard;
- Adjoining residents would be affected by any such development;
- The Youth Soccer Club now uses a pitch at North Sligo Sports Centre and may not have any future interest in the land;
- The site is located within the parish of Maugherow, not Grange.

Opinion

Submissions no. E-2 and 5 actually request a predominantly residential zoning on these lands, along with smaller zonings for the provision of playing pitches, club house and a burial ground. See submissions E-2 and 5 (below) for further details.

The subject submission however concerns the objection to the zoning of these lands for use as a school, cemetery and playing fields. These lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP and are significantly detached from the development limit of the Grange mini-plan. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such community uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

Access to these lands (along the L-7209) is also particularly problematic. Pedestrian access would be difficult given the distance from the village centre, the restricted road width and the absence of appropriate footpath and public lighting facilities. Vehicular access is also severely restricted as the road is substandard in terms of width and the site connects to the village centre over two humped bridges, one of which is a Protected Structure. The provision of such facilities at this location would require major upgrading of the road, bridges and associated pedestrian facilities. The access restrictions outlined above present significant capacity and alignment issues and options for modification would be extremely limited.

Having regard to the above it is agreed that these lands should not be zoned for use as a school, cemetery and playing fields.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. E-2

27 January 2010

Gavin Engineering on behalf of Gilleece Brothers Construction,
Grange Parish Pastoral Council and Cliffoey/Grange Youth Soccer F.C.

This submission should be read in conjunction with Submissions E-1 and 5.

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a plot of 23 acres at Aughagad, to the south of the Grange mini-plan development limit. The submission requests that 17 acres of the land be zoned for residential uses, 3 acres be zoned for use as a burial ground (supported by letter from Grange Parish Pastoral Council), and 3 acres be zoned for use as a soccer pitch, training ground and club house (supported by letter from Cliffoey/Grange Youth Soccer Club). The submission contends that this would provide improved community facilities and services for the area, and would also create employment.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. E1 (above), there are serious concerns regarding the rezoning of these lands given their location in the 'buffer zone' at a significant remove from the development limits of Grange, and having regard to the serious vehicular and pedestrian access problems that apply.

Furthermore, in relation to the proposed residential uses, the 'introduction' (above) outlines serious concerns regarding any additional residential development in Grange. The proposed residential land extends to 6.5 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 78 houses which would accommodate a further population of 171 persons. This can not be justified having regard to the extent of existing vacant housing, permitted residential developments and other greenfield lands zoned for residential development.

The Draft CDP adopts a flexible and supportive approach towards proposals for the provision of community facilities. Whilst such facilities should be located within the development limits of settlements, the Draft CDP does not preclude their location in rural areas subject to site suitability and other standard assessment. It should be noted that community facilities (including burial grounds and playing pitches) are developments that are 'open to consideration' within the 'Buffer Zone' as outlined in the Zoning Matrix (chapter 13 of the Draft CDP). There is therefore no requirement to zone the subject lands for the purpose of accommodating such facilities as the lands are already zoned as 'buffer zone'. It should be noted however that any such proposal at this location would be subject to standard assessment, particularly in relation to the access concerns outlined previously.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is recommended that the subject lands should remain zoned as 'buffer zone'.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 5

26 July 2010

Gavin Engineering on behalf of Gilleece Brothers Construction,
Grange Parish Pastoral Council and Cliffooney/Grange Youth Soccer F.C.

This submission is essentially the same as submission E-2, except that an additional map outlines the areas proposed for residential development and community facilities.

The opinions and recommendation of the planning authority are the same as outlined in response to submission E-2.

Submission no. 42

6 September 2010

Grange Newsletter, Grange Community Council

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to progress made on the current Grange mini-plan and encourages Sligo County Council to take more robust action to achieve concrete implementation of its goals including improved monitoring and co-ordination between all council departments.

Opinion

The majority of objectives contained in the current Grange mini-plan are medium to long term objectives and have not yet been achieved given that the mini-plan has only been in existence for five and a half years. These objectives are still considered relevant to the future development of Grange and accordingly were retained in the Draft mini-plan. Whilst the submission expresses the need for robust action and “an associated strategy and road map” to achieve concrete implementation of its goals, it does not expand upon these proposals in detail.

Implementation of the CDP is recognised as a difficult task which can be constrained by many factors. In this regard section 3.1.6 of the Draft CDP satisfactorily outlines the intentions of Sligo County Council regarding the future monitoring and implementation of the Plan which includes exercising all legal powers to ensure that objectives are implemented.

Issue no. 2

The submission highlights the importance and value of hedgerows and states that the Council should discourage their destruction.

Opinion

The issue of protecting hedgerows applies to the county as a whole and accordingly is covered in Volume 1 of the Draft CDP. Sections 7.1.3 and 7.1.4 deal with this issue and outline a range of policies and objectives which comprehensively address the matter. Furthermore, in the Development Standards section of the Draft CDP, sections 12.2.4 and 12.3.23 outline policies supporting the retention of existing hedgerows where possible.

The Planning Authority’s role regarding protection of hedgerows is limited and delivered primarily through the development management process and the implementation of the Roads Act. Destruction of hedgerows otherwise falls within the remit of the National Parks and Wildlife Service with the

DoEHLG who implement the relevant legislation. Section 40 of the Wildlife Act 1976, as amended by Section 46 of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000, restricts the cutting, grubbing, burning or destruction by other means of vegetation growing on uncultivated land or in hedges or ditches during the nesting and breeding season for birds and wildlife, from 1 March to 31 August.

These restrictions apply not only to private land-users but also to local authorities, public bodies and to contractors. There are some exemptions to the above restrictions for works carried out during the normal course of agriculture and forestry or where they are executed for public health and safety reasons by a statutory body. The provisions of the Wildlife Acts in relation to Section 40, including the relevant exemptions may be accessed at www.npws.ie/en/WildlifePlanningtheLaw/Legislation/.

In order to further encourage and assist in this regard it is considered that the CDP should provide improved guidance on the appropriate tree and shrub species for various situations. This is outlined in the recommendations below.

Issue no. 3

In relation to invasive species, the submission states that Japanese Knotweed has been identified in the Grange area and a programme of education and eradication is essential.

Opinion

The issue of invasive species is dealt with in section 7.1.7 of the Draft CDP which sets out policies and objectives in this regard. This includes undertaking a county-wide study to quantify the extent of particular invasive species (including Japanese Knotweed) for control/eradication, subject to the availability of resources (see objective O-NH-23). It is considered that this adequately addresses the matter in a comprehensive manner rather than providing a particular focus on Grange.

Section 52 of the Wildlife Act, 1976 as amended by the Wildlife Amendment Act, 2000 (subsection (7)) makes it an offence to release or allow any exotic (i.e. non-native) species, or to attempt to establish it in the wild, other than in accordance with a licence given under the Act to do so. The NPWS of the DoEHLG are currently considering amending Section 52 of the Act to provide greater legislative provision to deal with the issue of invasive species. In the interim, the National Invasive Species Database established by the National Biodiversity Data Centre provides up-to-date centralised information on the distribution of invasive species in Ireland in interactive web format.

The Invasive Species Ireland project is a joint venture between the Northern Ireland Environment Agency and the National Parks and Wildlife Service to implement the recommendations of the 2004 Invasive Species Ireland Report. The project website acts as a gateway to the Invasive Species Ireland project and provides information on a range of species, policy related to individual species or groups of species, and strategies to deal with invasive species. Control and where possible eradication of invasive species is an ongoing process, with public bodies and private landowners both taking action against invasive species that occur on lands under their control.

Issue no. 4

It is stated that consideration should be given to preserving the view of the Dartry Mountains from ‘the Old Road’.

Opinion

Section 7.4.3 of the Draft CDP outlines that scenic routes are roads which generally coincide with popular tourist routes passing through or close to Sensitive Rural Landscapes, or adjoining Visually Vulnerable Areas. In this regard scenic routes in Grange are limited to the main tourist route (N15) and local roads leading to the coastline or the Dartry Range. It would appear that the 'Old Road' refers to the L-7209 road to Aughagad (leading south of the Vocational School). Whilst views of the Dartry Range are available along this road, it is not considered that this is a popular route that is particularly connected with adjoining Sensitive Rural Landscapes / Visually Vulnerable Areas. Designation as a scenic route is therefore not warranted but development will nonetheless continue to be controlled having regard to the amenity value of the surrounding area.

Issue no. 5

The submission states that the Grange Village Design Statement should be linked to the planning system more clearly and should apply to all new buildings. It is also stated that a rural design guide for the County should be considered.

Opinion

Section 36.2 of the Draft CDP already outlines that anyone interested in building, replacing or renovating a structure in Grange should consult the Grange Village Design Statement for detailed design guidance. Whilst the design statement is not a statutory document, it is treated as a material consideration in the assessment of any development proposals in the Grange area and will continue to be so.

The Draft CDP provides some guidance on rural housing design in subsections 5.7.4 and 5.7.5, and subsections 12.3.18 to 12.3.23. Further guidance is provided by the built/architectural policies in Chapter 7.

Village design statements have been prepared for several villages in the County, and the adopted local area plans also include design guidance.

At pre-planning consultation stage, planners routinely advise relevant applicants to consult the Cork Rural Design Guidelines. However, the preparation of a design guidance document for rural and urban housing in County Sligo is a matter of resources and no such commitment can be made in the current financial circumstances.

Issue no. 6

The submission highlights the importance of upgrading sewerage treatment facilities in Grange. It states that restrictions should be placed on further development in the area until the new wastewater treatment plant is completed and operational, and that the Grange scheme should be progressed on its own as a standalone project.

Opinion

The planning authority acknowledges the importance of upgrading wastewater infrastructure and in this regard a new wastewater treatment works is proposed for Grange with a design PE (population equivalent) of 2500 (see Table 9.B in section 9.3 of Draft CDP). Sligo County Council will endeavour to progress this scheme subject to the availability of resources. As stated in section 36.7.B of the Draft Grange mini-plan, no additional development proposing to connect to the public wastewater treatment

plant will be permitted until these works are completed and operational. The Grange scheme will continue to be considered as part of the ‘bundled’ scheme which is included on the Water Services Investment Programme 2010-2012 and is highlighted as a priority scheme for Sligo County Council.

Issue no. 7

The submission recommends that allotments/community gardens should be promoted throughout the County and that an area of Grange Hill should be designated for allotment space.

Opinion

The Draft CDP was published prior to the commencement of the Planning and Development (Amendment) Act 2010, which introduced a definition for the term ‘allotment’. It is agreed that such facilities should be promoted throughout the County and this should be reflected in Chapter 6 (community facilities) and Chapter 13 (general mini-plan policies).

A large portion of Grange Hill is already zoned for ‘community facilities’ and ‘buffer zone’ which would be considered appropriate zoning categories to accommodate allotments. There is therefore no requirement to specifically designate an allotment space.

Issue no. 8

The submission states that there was clearly excessive zoning of land for residential development in the current mini-plan and welcomes the rezoning of residential lands to buffer zone as proposed in the Draft mini-plan. It also expresses opposition to two separate attempts to rezone land for residential development along the L-7209 road (one of which was proposed as a variation to the CDP 2005-2011 on 11th December 2006).

Opinion

Support for the enlarged buffer zone is noted. It should also be noted that the Draft mini-plan does not include any greenfield land along the L-7209 road that is proposed to be zoned for residential development. Please refer to submissions E1, E2 and 5 for further details.

Issue no. 9

It is stated that all new one-off rural dwellings should have a Building Energy Rating ‘A’ at a minimum in order to minimise future reliance on fuel sources.

Opinion

Building energy ratings is a matter covered by building regulations legislation and is therefore outside the remit of the Draft CDP.

Recommendations

A. The following policy should be inserted into **Section 13.5** of the Draft CDP:

Facilitate the development of allotments in the ‘buffer zone’ and at other suitable locations. Any such facility should be located within or close to existing settlements and should be easily accessible.

B. The following paragraph should be added to **Section 12.2.4** of the Draft CDP:

In considering what native tree and shrub species are appropriate to each particular situation, the planning authority will have regard to the details set out in the publication by The Heritage Council – ‘Conserving and enhancing wildlife in Towns and Villages’. Applicants and developers are therefore advised to consult this document and incorporate its recommendations into landscaping plans.

C. The recommended planting list contained in **Section 12.3.23** (in red) of the Draft CDP should be omitted and replaced with the following (in blue):

Recommended planting

Tree-species	Scots Pine, Sycamore, Oak, Willow, Hawthorn, Holly, Common hazel, Bog birch*, Rowan*, Common ash**, Common alder**, Common beech**, Common elder**
Hedgerow-species	Crab Apple, Blackthorn, Spindle, Guelder Rose
Coastal-species	Common Gorse, Fuchsia, Flax

Where setbacks are necessary in the interests of road safety, a natural boundary with native species should be re-established along the new setback line. Whilst hawthorn planting will generally be encouraged, the planning authority will have regard to the details set out in the publication by The Heritage Council – ‘Conserving and enhancing wildlife in Towns and Villages’. Applicants and developers are therefore advised to consult this document and incorporate its recommendations into landscaping plans.

Submission no. 95

8 September 2010

Martin Gilroy

Issue no. 1

The submission objects to the proposed alteration of the current Grange Mini-Plan regarding the rezoning of a portion of land to the southeast of the development limit at Aughagad (marked as plot 95.1 on map 1) from ‘residential uses’ to ‘buffer zone’. The submission argues that the lands in question are located adjacent to existing residential development within easy walking distance of the village core. The submission also argues that the lands in question are located along the proposed link road between the re-aligned N15 and the village and will therefore avail of improved vehicular, cycling and pedestrian access to the village upon completion of this road.

Opinion

As outlined in the Introduction above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential uses having regard to the extent of existing land zoned and residential vacancy rates.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as ‘buffer zone’ in accordance with the Draft CDP, the aim of which is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The

zoning of the lands for residential uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

The lands are accessed off the L-7209 road. As outlined in response to submissions E1, E2 and 5, access at this location is particularly problematic and accordingly the zoning of further lands is not recommended.

The submission makes reference to the proposed link road from the N15 which will result in improved access to these lands. However, it should be noted that this proposed route is still at preliminary design stage and therefore any alteration to the zoning of adjacent lands on the basis of this preliminary route would be considered premature.

Accordingly it is not recommended that the subject lands should be zoned for residential uses.

Issue no. 2

The submission objects to the proposed alteration of the Grange Mini-Plan regarding the rezoning of a portion of land to the west of the development limit at Cloontyprucklish (marked as plot 95.2 on map 1) from 'residential use' to 'buffer zone'. The submission argues that the lands in question are located adjacent to the new "hub" of the village adjacent to a range of services and that this proximity means that these lands should be zoned for residential purposes.

Opinion

It should be noted that these lands are actually zoned for a mixture of 'residential uses' and 'village centre type mix of uses' in the current CDP.

As outlined in response to issue 1 (above) serious concerns again apply regarding the location of the subject lands in the 'buffer zone' and the zoning of any additional land for residential development. Whilst it is acknowledged that the lands are located close to the village centre, it is considered that existing vacant units, permitted residential developments and greenfield sites identified in the Draft CDP will be more than adequate to cater for residential requirements during the plan period.

The lands are not connected to the village centre with appropriate footpath and public lighting facilities. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety.

Accordingly it is not recommended that the subject lands should be zoned for residential uses.

Issue no. 3

The submission contends that, given the decision of Sligo County Council to zone these lands as residential in the current CDP, the costs incurred by investment in the progression of these lands will have to be transferred to Sligo County Council for reimbursement if the proposed amendments are adopted.

Opinion

Section 10 (8) of the Planning and Development (Amendment) Act 2010 outlines that, "There shall be no presumption in law that any zoned land in a particular development plan (including a development plan that has been varied) shall remain so zoned in any subsequent development plan".

The planning authority has therefore reviewed downward the extent of lands zoned for residential development due to the oversupply of zoned land, the extent of vacant housing in the area, and the

need to be compliant with the recommended population levels as outlined in the 'introduction' above. It is considered that this was necessary in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 101

8 September 2010

D. Harte & Associates
on behalf of Frank McHugh

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a portion of land to the southeast of the proposed development limit in the Draft Mini-Plan and requests that it be retained within the development limit in accordance with the current Mini-Plan. The submission refers to three previous planning applications which were lodged by the landowner and concludes that he has done his utmost to develop the lands in question. Furthermore, the submission argues that were it not for "numerous delays" by SCC personnel "the lands would be developed at this stage". The submission argues that the landowner has incurred significant costs as a consequence of his involvement in the planning process including land purchase costs, consultants' fees, machinery hire, solicitors' fees and travel from the UK to attend planning meetings.

The submission also argues that the development of the lands in question could provide a portion of the proposed link road between the re-aligned N15 and the village, thereby reducing the costs associated with the provision of this link road, that it is unfair to preclude the development of these lands on the basis of a road which may never be constructed, that the site is serviceable by gravity from the mains sewer and that the fees generated by the development would be much needed by the County Council.

Opinion

It should be noted that not all of these lands are zoned for residential uses in the current Grange mini-plan as the lands to the east of the L-7209 are zoned as 'buffer zone'.

These lands are located adjacent to those referred to in submission no. 95 (plot 95b) and accordingly the same concerns apply in relation to the zoning of additional lands for residential development, conflict with the aims of the 'buffer zone', and serious deficiencies with regard to pedestrian and vehicular access.

The lands extend to 2.8 hectares and would have potential to provide at least 33 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 74 persons.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a planning history relating to these lands, it should be noted that none of these applications were made on foot of the land being zoned for residential uses in the 2005-2011 CDP as there were no planning applications on these lands after this zoning was adopted. It is acknowledged that these applications experienced significant difficulties but this was largely due to the extremely poor standard of access to the lands as outlined earlier in this report.

The planning authority has since had to review downward the extent of lands zoned for residential development due to the oversupply of zoned land, the extent of vacant housing in the area, and the need to be compliant with the recommended population levels as outlined in the ‘introduction’ above.

The lands discussed in this submission are affected by the proposed link road which extends from the existing N15 to the proposed N4/N15 Sligo to County Boundary Realignment. This scheme is in Phase 4 of the NRA Project Management Guidelines - Preliminary Design. In this context the design process is still at an early stage and may be subject to modification. However, the zoning of land for residential uses should be done on its own merits and not on the basis of contribution towards the construction of this link route.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is recommended that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 107

8 September 2010

Rosaleen Lang

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the zoning of a portion of land to the west of Eugene Gilbride Memorial Bridge be altered from ‘commercial uses’ to ‘residential uses’ in order to facilitate the construction of a dwelling house for a member of the landowner’s immediate family.

Opinion

The subject site and adjoining lands to the east are proposed to be zoned as ‘commercial uses’ in the Draft CDP. The housing needs of the landowner’s family are acknowledged in this regard and it is considered that this could be accommodated whilst still achieving the objective of commercial development on the remainder of the lands. There is existing development to the west of the site and therefore the proposed house would not be further extending development at this location.

Given that this would essentially constitute a one-off house, a residential zoning is not considered necessary as rural-generated housing needs can be accommodated in the ‘buffer zone’ as outlined in response to Submission 114 in Volume 1, and subject to compliance with standard development management criteria.

Recommendation

The **Draft Grange Mini-Plan zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective of the lands marked as **107a** from ‘commercial uses’ to ‘buffer zone’.

Martin McGloin
on behalf of Patrick Gilmartin

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a plot of land to the north of the primary school and Church. The site is proposed to be zoned in the Draft Mini-Plan as ‘community facilities’ and the submission requests that it be rezoned to ‘residential uses’ in accordance with the current Grange Mini-Plan.

The submission states that it is the landowner’s intention to develop the lands for “development related to independent housing for the retired and elderly, possibly a low / medium density development of small 1-2 bed single storey housing units”. It is argued that the site is suitable for this type of development due to its proximity to nearby services. The submission states that the landowner has expended significant resources in research and preparation works for this development. It is argued that due to the “urgent need” for elderly/retirement housing within the Grange area the zoning of the site should be amended to ‘residential uses’ in order to allow the planned development to proceed.

Opinion

As outlined in the ‘introduction’ (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of any additional land for residential development having regard to the extent of land already zoned and existing residential vacancy rates.

The subject lands adjoin other existing and proposed community facilities and accordingly would be considered appropriate to accommodate the extension of existing facilities or to facilitate the sharing of resources/services between various community interests at this location.

However, it is considered that development of the type proposed (i.e. accommodation for the elderly, which would be associated with some form of institutional assistance) would be permissible in accordance with the proposed ‘community facilities’ zoning of the Draft CDP. Therefore, there would be no requirement to amend the Draft CDP.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission relating to Mullaghmore Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant feature of the submissions received concerns requests to zone additional lands for residential development. The vast majority of lands involved are proposed to be zoned as 'Buffer Zone' in the Draft Plan. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Mullaghmore is categorised as a 'village supporting the rural community' and has a recommended population level of 180 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 136 persons for Mullaghmore in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 32% compared to the 7% rate experienced between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Mullaghmore will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that approximately 1.67 hectares of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Mullaghmore Mini-Plan including 7 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 1.4 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 95 residential units which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 210 persons.
- The wastewater treatment system in the village has a design capacity of 320PE (population equivalent) and is currently significantly overloaded. Whilst a new treatment works is proposed, progression of this scheme will be subject to funding and other resource requirements.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 10.2 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 123 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 271 persons (approximately double that of the estimated current population). This would further raise the population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.

Submission no. 54

7 September 2010

Ann J. Keenan

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to a portion of land close to the northernmost tip of Mullaghmore Head. It is proposed to develop these lands with the provision of a 40-bed nursing home and combined retirement units to cater for 10 people. Details regarding the servicing/design of the development are provided and it is stated that the proposal would provide an important service along with employment for the local area.

Opinion

The subject site is proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP and Mullaghmore mini-plan. The aim of the buffer zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of these lands for development would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

The lands are located between the proposed mini-plan development limit and the coastline (which adjoins a designated SAC/pNHA) and it is an objective of the planning authority, as stated in section 38.1E of the Draft CDP, to generally retain these lands free from development.

The coastline is designated as Visually Vulnerable and it is an objective of the Draft CDP to discourage any developments that would be detrimental to the unique character of such areas (O-LCAP-4, page 120). The subject lands are also designated as Sensitive Rural Landscape in accordance with the Draft CDP and it is an objective of the planning authority to strictly control new development at such locations (O-LCAP-5, page 120).

Having regard to the exceptional landscape character and nature conservation value of the Mullaghmore area it is considered that development should be limited to the area within the proposed development limit on the eastern side of Mullaghmore Head.

Furthermore, there would be serious concerns regarding the absence of appropriate services at this location such as footpaths, public lighting etc. The road is substandard in terms of width and alignment and would not be suitable for significant additional traffic. Wastewater treatment facilities for Mullaghmore are significantly overloaded at present and on-site treatment would not be facilitated.

The subject site should therefore remain as a 'buffer zone'.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 70

8 September 2010

Castlegal Architectural Services
on behalf of James & Linda Conway

Issue no. 1

The submission outlines the housing needs of the landowners. Whilst a larger landholding is outlined, it would appear that the submission requests that a portion at the north-western extremity of this landholding be zoned for residential development in order to accommodate the construction of one dwellinghouse.

Opinion

As outlined in the Introduction above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development.

The site is proposed to be zoned as 'Buffer Zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP and is significantly detached from the development limit of the Mullaghmore mini-plan. The aim of the 'Buffer Zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The

zoning of individual sites for residential development, as is proposed, would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this sensitive location.

Furthermore, it should be noted that a residential zoning would not be necessary for the construction of one-off housing. Any rural-generated housing proposal would be accommodated within the 'Buffer Zone' if an appropriate case can be established in accordance with details set out in response to Submission no. 114, and subject to compliance with all other standard development management criteria and assessment.

The subject lands should therefore not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 100

8 September 2010

Haran & Associates
on behalf of Bernard Oats

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to a portion of land to the south-west of the proposed development limit. Whilst the submission is not clear, it would appear that it requests that the lands be included within the development limit and be zoned for residential development. The submission argues that the lands in question are adjacent to the development limit and are currently used as a caravan park. It is stated that the lands are within easy walking distance of the village core, are served by the public sewer and do not contain any protected structures or sites of geological or archaeological interest. The submission also argues that any further development on site would be low-profile in nature and therefore in accordance with Section 38.6 of the Draft CDP (which relates to Residential Development).

Opinion

As outlined in the Introduction above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development. The proposed zoning would also conflict with the aims of the 'Buffer Zone' as outlined in response to submissions 54 & 70 above. It is therefore recommended that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

The submission also mentions the existing use of the lands. In this regard the existing use of some of the lands in question as a caravan park is acknowledged. However, it should be noted that the zoning matrix as contained within Section 13 of the Draft CDP states that the use of land for 'Camping and Caravan Park' is open to consideration within the 'Buffer Zone'.

Within this context the location of the lands in question within the buffer zone would not preclude the continued operation of the caravan park or indeed its expansion subject to normal development management considerations (see submission no. 109 below for further details in this regard). There is therefore no requirement to include the subject lands within the development limits.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Ciarán & Eithne Martin

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the zoning of a portion of land to the southwest of Mullaghmore be amended from ‘buffer zone’ to ‘tourism related uses’ with particular reference toward the provision of a mobile home park. Alternatively it is requested that the lands be designated as suitable for a mobile home park via a written objective in the Draft CDP.

The submission argues that the lands in question are directly between two existing caravan parks and that the designation of the site for the provision of tourism related uses would facilitate tourist related development which would bring visitors and commerce to the village, thereby underpinning existing services. It is stated that the proposed zoning of the lands would facilitate the creation of employment and income for the Local Authority in the form of rates, water charges etc.

The submission argues that Mullaghmore has an ageing population with less dependence on village services due to constrictions in the property market relating to price and availability. The submission goes on to state that the lands referred to are within easy walking distance of the village core and the beach thereby reducing the need for traffic movements. It is stated that development on-site will be serviced by a temporary on-site effluent treatment system in the absence of the proposed upgrading of wastewater treatment facilities in Mullaghmore.

It is stated that the proposed development will be run to a high standard having regard to the applicants experience in this area and the fact that they will reside on-site. The submission makes reference to the area of land within the development limit which is zoned for tourism related uses within the Draft Mini-Plan, stating that the plots are small and would require consolidation in order to be economically viable thereby creating potential complications. It is also stated that these lands are isolated from the existing mobile home parks in the village.

Opinion

The location of the lands between two existing caravan parks is noted. There is a long-established history and demand for the use of such facilities in Mullaghmore and it would be considered appropriate to consolidate at this location. However, as outlined in response to submission no. 100 (above), the provision of such a facility would be ‘open to consideration’ in the ‘buffer zone’ subject to normal assessment and development management criteria.

There is therefore no requirement to amend existing zoning at this location. The alternative suggestion of the submission (i.e. to deal with the issue via a written objective) is considered a more appropriate solution. It is also considered that this should be expanded to include surrounding lands (including those outlined in submission no.100) and this should be indicated on the objectives map.

However, it should be noted that wastewater treatment proposals would be of critical importance in this regard and the suggested on-site solution may not be acceptable to the planning authority.

Recommendations

A. The following objective should be added to **section 38.7** of the Draft CDP:

Encourage the consolidation of caravan, camping and mobile home park facilities on and between the sites of existing facilities to the southwest of the development limits (i.e. on the land marked as ENT 1 on objectives map). Such facilities shall only be permitted subject to standard assessment and development management criteria, and particularly subject to satisfactory proposals regarding wastewater treatment and disposal.

- B.** The Mullaghmore objectives map should be amended as shown on map 3, by adding site ENT-1 (marked as 109b) to indicate the extent of the lands referred to in recommendation (A) above.

Submission no. 112

8 September 2010

Ray McDaid, Architectural Design Consultant & Surveyor
on behalf of John McHugh

Issue no. 1

The submission relates to lands to the north of Mullaghmore and notes the proposed zoning of these lands as ‘buffer zone’ and ‘utilities’. The requirement for an extension/improvement of wastewater treatment facilities is acknowledged, as is the need for the provision of a buffer zone in sensitive coastal locations to prevent overdevelopment.

However, the submission argues that an excessive portion of the relevant lands have been zoned ‘buffer zone’ and requests that the zoning of a significant portion of these lands be amended to ‘residential uses’. The submission argues that the lands in question are adjacent to existing residential development and that a road, footpath and services have already been laid to access the lands in question.

Opinion

As outlined in the Introduction above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development. The zoning of these lands would also conflict with the aims of the ‘buffer zone’ as outlined in response to other submissions within Mullaghmore.

The lands extend to 2.7 hectares and would have the potential to provide 32 houses which would accommodate an additional population of 71 persons (approximately 50% of the estimated current population).

Whilst it is acknowledged that there is potential access to these lands, and that some of the lands may offer potential to appropriately ‘round-off’ development at the northern end of the village at some time in the future, the zoning of the lands would be considered premature at this juncture.

The lands are located on the periphery of the existing built-up area and in accordance with the principles of sequential development, as outlined in section 3.4.1 of the Draft CDP, it is considered that infill lands should be prioritised in order to ensure better use of under-utilised lands.

Approximately 7 hectares of potential infill lands have been identified in Mullaghmore and this represents ample opportunity to provide additional housing in a sequential and sustainable manner.

The subject lands should not therefore be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 120

8 September 2010

Martin McGloin
on behalf of Liam McHugh, James Conway & John Donlevy

Issue no. 1

The submission notes the proposed zoning of the relevant lands, which are situated to the southwest of Mullaghmore, as 'buffer zone' and requests that the zoning of these lands be amended to 'residential/tourism related uses'. The submission states that the lands in question were the subject of a previous planning application which was only refused on the basis of a lack of infrastructural capacity. The submission argues that the development limit should be redrawn because the inclusion of these lands would result in a more "natural" development limit inclusive of the two existing caravan parks to the North East. It is stated that the site is accessible by road and that the mains sewer runs across the site.

The submission makes reference to the lands zoned for residential purposes within the development limit stating that much of it will be difficult to access and develop due to its backland nature and the multiple ownerships involved. It is argued that the submitted lands are subject to none of these issues and would be simpler to develop on a shorter term. The submission suggests that the lands could be developed as individual serviced sites for the provision of detached dwelling houses on a low-density basis which would be suitable for family occupation. The provision of a green area providing views of the bay is also referred to, as is compliance with Section 38.6 (d) of the Draft Mini-Plan.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development. The zoning of these lands would also conflict with the aims of the 'buffer zone' as outlined in response to other submissions within Mullaghmore.

Contrary to that indicated in this submission, a previous application on this site (PL 07/616) was refused on grounds that included adverse impact on visual amenities and proper planning of the area. It should also be noted that there were a number of 3rd party objections to the proposed development.

Whilst it is acknowledged that a lot of the lands zoned for residential development may be in separate ownerships, this issue can be satisfactorily addressed through co-ordinated land assembly as outlined in section 38.6.D of the Draft CDP. Whilst all lands may not come forward for development, it is considered that ample opportunity exists given that the total amounts to 7 hectares.

It is noted that the submission also requests a 'tourism related uses' zoning. In this regard it is again considered that sufficient land has been reserved for this purpose on more suitable infill lands closer to the village centre (i.e. on lands zoned for 'tourism related uses' and 'mixed uses'). Furthermore, as outlined in response to submission no. 109, an area has been identified for the accommodation of caravan and camping development.

Accordingly it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential or tourism related uses.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 121

8 September 2010

Martin McGloin

on behalf of Liam McHugh, McHugh & Gallagher

Issue no. 1

The submission notes the proposed zoning of the relevant lands, which are situated to the north of Mullaghmore, as 'buffer zone' and requests that the zoning of these lands be amended to 'residential uses'. The submission states that the lands in question were purchased as development land and were the subject of a previous planning application which was only refused on the basis of a lack of infrastructural capacity. The submission argues that the development limit should be redrawn because the inclusion of these lands would result in a more "natural" development limit. It is stated that the site is accessible by road and that the development of the site would facilitate road improvements. The submission also refers to the fact that the mains sewer runs across the site.

The submission makes reference to the lands zoned for residential purposes within the development limit stating that much of it will be difficult to access and develop due to its backland nature and the multiple ownerships involved. It is argued that the lands referred to are subject to none of these issues and would be simpler to develop on a shorter term. The submission suggests that the lands could be developed as individual serviced sites for the provision of detached dwelling houses on a low-density basis which would be suitable for family occupation. The provision of a green area providing views of the bay is also referred to, as is compliance with Section 38.6 (d) of the Draft Mini-Plan.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional lands for residential development. The zoning of these lands would also conflict with the aims of the 'buffer zone' as outlined in response to other submissions within Mullaghmore.

Similar to that outlined in response to submission no. 112, it is considered that these lands may offer potential to appropriately 'round-off' development at the northern end of the village at some time in the future. Again however, the zoning of the lands would be considered premature at this juncture having regard to the outlined residential requirements and the principles of sequential development.

Contrary to that indicated in this submission, a previous application on this site (PL 07/601) was refused on grounds that included adverse impact on visual amenities, traffic hazard and proper planning of the area. It should also be noted that there were a number of 3rd party objections to the proposed development.

Whilst it is acknowledged that a lot of the lands zoned for residential development may be in separate ownerships, this issue can be satisfactorily addressed through co-ordinated land assembly as outlined in section 38.6.D of the Draft CDP. Whilst all lands may not come forward for development, it is considered that ample opportunity exists given that the total amounts to 7 hectares.

Accordingly it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential or tourism related uses.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Rathcormack Mini-Plan

Submission no. 38

3 Sept 2010

Patrick J. Watters

Issue no. 1

This submission would appear to refer to Mr Watters's existing house and a small plot of adjoining land to the south-east. The submission requests that the site be zoned for 'residential uses'.

Opinion

The site is located at the northwestern extremity of the plan limit and is detached from the existing built-up area of Rathcormack. It is proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP and Rathcormack mini-plan. The aim of the 'buffer zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of additional lands for residential development would therefore conflict with these aims, particularly given the detached and sporadic nature of this request.

The subject lands are located outside the 50kph speed limit zone and there is no footpath to link the lands to the village centre. Accordingly there are traffic hazard concerns in relation to the zoning of the lands for residential uses.

Mr Watters' intentions for development of these lands are not clear. However, given the limited area of land concerned, it would appear that the submission seeks to protect the existing residential use, and possibly provide for an additional one-off house. In this regard it is considered that a residential zoning is not necessary as regard will be had to the existing residential use at this location, and any proposal for an additional one-off house could be considered in the 'buffer zone'. Any rural-generated housing need proposal would be accommodated subject to compliance with the criteria outlined in response to Submission no. 114 (in Volume 1) and other standard development management criteria, particularly in relation to access onto the N15 National Primary Route.

It is therefore considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 93

8 September 2010

Glen Gilmour

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the zoning of an area of land to the north of Rathcormack be amended from 'buffer zone' to 'mixed uses' to allow the potential for the setting up of a family business in the future.

Opinion

Having regard to the predominantly backland nature of the lands in question and their location on the periphery of the village, it is not considered appropriate that these lands should be zoned for 'mixed uses'. There is already a significant portion of lands zoned for 'mixed uses' closer to the village core and these would be considered a priority for development on the basis of the sequential approach.

However, having regard to the location of the subject lands adjacent to an area which is currently zoned for 'business & enterprise', an extension of this zoning is considered to be appropriate, thereby facilitating the setting up of a business or indeed the expansion of the adjacent premises.

Recommendations

The Rathcormack zoning map should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands annotated as 93a from 'buffer zone' to 'business and enterprise'.

Submission no. 126

8 September 2010

Jimmy Mulvey, Secretary

on behalf of Rathcormac Sewerage Scheme Committee

Issue no. 1

The submission requests an amendment to Chapter 9, Volume 1, Table 9.B, to include a commitment that during the lifetime of the plan, Sligo County Council will seek funding from the Department of Environment for the siting of a pumping station and carrying out all ancillary works, to connect Rathcormac to the Sligo Main Drainage Scheme.

An amendment to the Rathcormac Mini Plan under the heading "Infrastructure" is also requested inclusive of a commitment to provide a pumping station and all ancillary works as outlined above.

Opinion

There are currently no proposals for the provision of public wastewater treatment infrastructure in Rathcormack. Whilst connection to the Sligo Main Drainage Scheme is specifically mentioned in this submission, it should be noted that this is not the only option available to explore. In this regard it is considered that further assessment on feasibility is required as the first step in this process and this should be reflected in the Draft CDP.

Recommendations

A. The following entry should be inserted into **Table 9.B** of the Draft Plan

Town/Scheme	Current design PE	Existing outfall / treatment	New design PE	Remarks
Rathcormack	N/A	N/A	N/A	Funding will be sought from the DoEHLG to assess the feasibility of providing public wastewater treatment.

B. In **Chapter 40**, under the heading **Infrastructure**, the last line should be amended as follows:

There is no public wastewater treatment facility in the village and it is not envisaged that such facility will be provided during the lifetime of this Plan at present. However, the Council will seek funding from the DoEHLG to assess the feasibility of providing same.

Submissions relating to Rosses Point Mini-Plan

Introduction

A significant proportion of the submissions received contain requests to zone additional lands for residential development. The vast majority of these lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. There are serious concerns in relation to the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the following:

- Rosses Point is categorised as a Principal Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 950 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 816 persons for Rosses Point in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 16.4%, compared to a rate of 13% experienced between 2002 and 2006.
- During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Rosses Point will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the extent of vacancy is difficult to assess in Rosses Point given the prevalence of holiday homes. However, 2010 survey figures from the DoEHLG indicate that there are at least 28 vacant properties which could accommodate an additional population of approximately 62 persons.
- In addition to this the Draft Rosses Point Mini-Plan includes 2.74 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential development, and 0.6 hectares of greenfield land zoned for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 38 residential units, which would accommodate a population of 82 persons. Furthermore, these greenfield sites only account for large sites and do not include the significant extent of small infill sites zoned throughout the Plan area.
- The Draft mini-plan therefore already provides for an additional population of at least 144 persons (i.e. combined capacity of vacant housing and zoned lands), which would represent a 17.6% increase on the estimated current population.
- Cumulatively, the submissions received request that a total of 9 hectares of additional land be zoned for residential uses. This would result in the potential for the provision of least a further 108 houses, resulting in a potential additional population of 237 persons (i.e. a 29% increase on the current population). This would further raise the potential population significantly in excess of the recommended level and accordingly there is clearly no justification to zone additional land for residential development.
- Furthermore, the existing wastewater treatment facilities are overloaded, particularly during peak tourist season. Whilst the Rosses Point-Cregg-Ballincar scheme has been included within the DoEHLG programme 2010-2012, advancement of the scheme will be subject to the availability of funding and resources. In the absence of such facilities, opportunities for additional residential development will be extremely limited.

Margaret Ryan

Issue no. 1

The submission is in relation to a site in Rosses Point (marked as site 4.1 on map 1) which has been identified as suitable for the development of a multi-purpose community facility in accordance with section 42.5.A of the Draft CDP. The submission objects to this and requests that the lands be retained for residential use, and particularly the accommodation of family members.

Opinion

Having reviewed Mrs Ryan's lands, it is noted that there is a previous planning permission for residential development on the site. It is also considered that there is an established residential character along this cul-de-sac road which should be preserved. Whilst concerns have been raised regarding additional residential development in the 'introduction' above, this residential proposal would constitute small infill development and would not therefore significantly contribute to the overall extent of greenfield land zoned for residential uses. Accordingly there would be no objection to the zoning of the lands for residential uses.

Issue no. 2

It is suggested that the church lands to the east and south-east (marked as site 4.2 on map 1) would be more suitable for the accommodation of community facilities.

Opinion

It is accepted that the adjoining church lands to the east offer potential for the accommodation of community facilities and that this would be consistent with existing uses at this location. There would therefore be no objection to the zoning of these lands for community facilities.

Recommendations

A. The **Rosses Point Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for lands marked as **4a** from 'community facilities' to 'residential uses'.

B. The **Rosses Point Objectives Map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by removing the 'CF1' designation from the lands outlined in **submission no. 4**.

C. **Section 42.5.A** of the Draft CDP (text shown in red below) should be deleted.

~~Encourage the establishment of a multi-purpose community facility on lands marked CF-1.~~

D. The **Rosses Point Zoning map** should be amended as shown in map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands marked as **4d** (i.e. the Church lands) from 'residential uses' to 'community facilities'.

Submission no. 7

18 August 2010

Bishop Christopher Jones, Bishop of Elphin

This submission should be read in conjunction with submission no. 4 (as outlined above).

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to lands belonging to Mrs Margaret Ryan adjacent to the church grounds (proposed to be zoned 'community facilities' in the Draft CDP) and confirms the understanding that these lands were intended for the accommodation of the housing needs of family members. The submission confirms that there is no objection in this regard.

Opinion

As outlined in submission no. 4 there is no objection to changing the zoning of these lands from 'community facilities' to 'residential uses'.

Recommendations

No further change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 51

7 September 2010

Malachy & Mary Gillen & Sheila (Gillen) Harman

Issue no. 1

The submission objects to the zoning of a portion of their lands (marked as 51.1 on map 1) for 'community facilities' in order to accommodate the potential expansion of the burial grounds. It is stated that the lands are currently used for agriculture, contain a bored well drinking water supply, and that the proposed use would be an unacceptable intrusion on the privacy of their house (a Protected Structure RPS-221).

Opinion

Concerns in relation to existing uses on these lands are noted. It is also noted that objection has been raised under submission no.'s 52 & 68 and in this regard there is no objection to removing the proposed zoning from the lands.

However, it is considered important to reserve land to accommodate the potential expansion of the burial ground. In this regard it is considered that lands to the north of the existing burial ground would offer a suitable alternative and should be zoned accordingly.

Issue no. 2

The submission suggests that the area between the Parochial House and Church (marked as 51.2 on map 1) should be used as a burial ground.

Opinion

The lands between the Parochial House and Church are already proposed to be zoned for 'community facilities' and accordingly could accommodate burial grounds if deemed appropriate. Furthermore, it

is recommended that additional lands at this location be zoned for 'community facilities' as outlined in response to submission no. 4.

Issue no. 3

The submission also objects to the zoning of lands opposite their dwellinghouse (marked as 51.3 on map 1) for 'community facilities' as this would detract from their house, which is a 'tourist attraction'. It is suggested that this area should be kept as an 'open area'.

Opinion

As outlined in submission no. 4, it is agreed that these lands should not be zoned for 'community facilities'. However, this is not considered a suitable site for a public open space given its distance from the village core area and the predominant character of private residential houses surrounding the site. The 'residential' zoning should therefore be applied in accordance with recommendation outlined in response to submission no. 4.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Rosses Point Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective of the lands marked as **51a** from 'community facilities' to 'buffer zone'.
- B.** The **Rosses Point Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective of lands to the north of the existing burial ground (marked as **51b** on map 3) from 'buffer zone' to 'community facilities'.
- C.** The **Rosses Point objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 4, by relocating the site of CF2 to the site marked as **51c** (i.e. the site to the north of the existing burial ground as outlined in recommendation (B) above).

Submission no. 52

7 September 2010

Redmond & Catherine Gillen

Issue no. 1

The submission objects to the zoning of their lands (marked as 52.1 on map 1) to the west of the cemetery for 'community facilities'.

Opinion

As outlined in response to submission no. 51, there is no objection to the relocation of proposed burial ground facilities.

Issue no. 2

The submission suggests that the lands between the Church and Parochial House (marked as 52.2 on map 1) would be a suitable location for additional burial ground space.

Opinion

The lands between the Parochial House and Church are already proposed to be zoned for 'community facilities' and accordingly could accommodate burial grounds if deemed appropriate. Furthermore, it is recommended that additional lands at this location be zoned for 'community facilities' as outlined in response to submission no. 4.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 68

8 September 2010

R.S. Callagy

Issue no. 1

The submission suggests the inclusion of a number of policies in Chapter 13 which covers general policies that are applicable to all mini-plans. These include policies to:

- a) correct the negative impact of derelict properties;
- b) curtail the negative effects of water-based activities at coastal locations;
- c) encourage street names and estates names that reflect the character of local areas;
- d) accommodate allotment gardening in the Buffer Zones;
- e) develop litter control signs/awareness at the entrances to villages.

Opinion

- a) Dealing with derelict sites is primarily an operational matter and Sligo County Council will continue to work with owners of such properties in accordance with Derelict Sites legislation. In addition to this, Chapter 13 already includes policies encouraging the redevelopment of derelict sites / vacant structures (see policies 13.2 C-E).
- b) The mini-plans are primarily concerned with land-use matters and accordingly do not go into the detail of water-based activities. This issue should be dealt with under various bye-laws.
- c) This issue is not specific to the mini-plan areas and it is therefore considered that it is adequately covered in the development management standards section 12.3.14.
- d) The Draft CDP was published prior to the commencement of the Planning and Development (Amendment) Act 2010, which introduced a definition for the term 'allotment'. The term did not appear in the mini-plans zoning matrix of the Draft CDP but it is agreed that it now should and also that it should be accommodated in the Buffer Zone areas. It is considered that this issue is adequately covered in response to submission no. 42 (Grange).
- e) It is considered that this issue would be better covered under Sligo County Council's Litter Management Plan.

Issue no. 2

The submission includes a number of suggestions in relation to the Rosses Point mini-plan. These include the following:

- a) the inclusion of all of Oyster Island and part of Coney Island within the plan limit;
- b) the inclusion of the village street in plans for improved pedestrian linkages and the requirement for developers to contribute towards this;
- c) provision of a footpath from the Golf Club to the church, and linking to the village street;
- d) encourage street names and estates names that reflect the character of local area;
- e) address the need for traffic and parking control at the start of the promenade, including the provision of a roundabout;
- f) extend the 'community facilities' zoning around the church southward as far as the village street;
- g) resolve conflict between the zoning of land for 'community facilities' around the Protected Structure RPS-221. It is suggested that additional graveyard space could be accommodated on church property;
- h) the inclusion of the "old watchhouse" on the scenic walk on the RPS;
- i) the inclusion of the "new watch house" on the golf club 1st tee on the RPS;
- j) record the location of the gun emplacements and ammunition store on Bormore Head;
- k) indicate the site of the proposed new pumping station.

Opinion

- a) It is acknowledged that these areas are functionally connected to Rosses Point. However, the planning authority would apply strict controls to any development proposals in these areas in order to protect their particular visual amenity and conservation values. Therefore, if included within the mini-plan, these areas could only be considered as 'buffer zones'.

In this regard it is considered that the protection of these areas would be better achieved through application of the Landscape Characterisation Map. However, having reviewed this map it is noted that Oyster Island is not actually covered by the Sensitive Rural Landscape and Visually Vulnerable Area designation. This would appear to be a mapping error and should be corrected as outlined in the recommendation below.

- b, c) As stated in section 13.3.A, it is the policy of planning authority to strive to achieve the upgrading of footpaths in all mini-plan areas wherever possible. This includes the areas mentioned in the submission. Furthermore, section 42.3 of the Plan deals with improved pedestrian circulation within Rosses Point and the aim of objective 42.3.D is to ensure that the issue of pedestrian circulation along the village street is addressed in a comprehensive manner. Developers already contribute to the improvement of footpaths through the Development Contributions Scheme which is attached as a condition of any planning permission. Alternatively, the provision of a footpath by the developer may be included as a condition of planning permission.
- d) This issue is not specific to the mini-plan areas and it is therefore considered that it is adequately covered in the development management standards section 12.3.14.
- e) As stated in section 13.3.A of the Draft CDP it is the policy of the planning authority to strive to achieve the upgrading of roads, car-parking and junctions within mini-plan areas and also to

The provision of a roundabout at this location is unlikely to be warranted but this, along with the provision of an off street car park at this location, would be best considered in the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan as outlined above.

- f) As outlined in response to submission no. 4, there is no objection to the zoning of these lands for 'community facilities'.
- g) As outlined in response to submission no. 51, it is agreed that these lands should not be identified for the accommodation of the burial ground extension and that graveyard space could be accommodated on the Church grounds if deemed appropriate.
- h & i) Please refer to Volume 2 of this Report for issues in relation to the Record of Protected Structures.
- j) Noted.
- k) As stated in section 42.8.A of the Draft CDP, the land at the existing wastewater treatment site is to be reserved for the provision of the pumping station. The site is also indicated on the objectives map.

Recommendation

The **Landscape Characterisation map** should be amended to designate Oyster Island as Sensitive Rural Landscape and the coastline of the island as Visually Vulnerable.

Submission no. 71

8 September 2010

Heather Chave-Cox

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to the proposed playground facilities as outlined in section 42.5.B of the Draft CDP, and states that the Middleton Estate has offered more suitable land for such facilities closer to the village centre (marked as site 71.1 on map 1). The submission contends that the alternative lands are more suitable in terms of accessibility and safety, and would be in keeping with other objectives of the mini-plan. It is stated that the shareowners in the Middleton Estate have not agreed to offer the site currently referred to in the Draft CDP.

Opinion

Section 42.5.B of the Rosses Point mini-plan supports the development of playground facilities on "lands zoned as open space to the south and west of the existing tennis courts / car park". This area is considered suitable given its location adjacent to the village core, the open and relatively undeveloped character of surrounding lands, its easy accessibility to adjoining residential areas, and its proximity to the coastal area with its associated recreational amenities/facilities. Whilst the submission raises concern in relation to land ownership, it should be noted that no particular site at this location is outlined in the Draft mini-plan. It should be noted however that Sligo County Council owns some of these lands.

The alternative playground location referred to in this submission constitutes a narrow wedge of land which is surrounded by roads on all sides. Traffic turning movements and speeds can be hazardous at

this location, particularly along the promenade road. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic safety at this location.

Having regard to the above, it is not considered that the Draft CDP should be amended.

Issue no. 2

The submission states that the tennis courts are also located on Middleton Estate lands. It requests that the lands (marked as site 71.2 on map 1) be zoned for 'mixed uses' so that it could be used to support local culture and history, and consequently tourism.

Opinion

The tennis courts and immediately surrounding area have an undeveloped and open character which adds to the coastal character and natural amenities of the area. Established uses at this location are predominantly recreational and low-impact in visual terms. It is considered that this should be retained in order to protect the character and natural amenities of this area, and to prevent urban sprawl in a westerly direction towards the coastline. The lands should not therefore be zoned for 'mixed uses'.

Issue no. 3

The submission refers to objective 42.2.B of the Draft CDP which aims to encourage the renovation of Elsinore House. It is stated that allowing a sensitive replacement of an old gate lodge in the vicinity of Elsinore House would help to achieve this objective. It is requested that the mixed use zone be extended westward (marked as site 71.3 on map 1) in order to facilitate such a development.

Opinion

As outlined in response to issue 2 (above), it is not considered that the mixed use zone should be extended further west as requested. The planning authority will continue to encourage the renovation of Elsinore House and the financial requirements of this are acknowledged.

However it is considered that section 7.3.5 of the Draft CDP adequately deals with this issue in terms of 'enabling development' policy, which relates to development that would be unacceptable in planning terms (e.g. inconsistent with zoning objectives for an area) but for the fact that it would bring significant public benefits in the form of securing the long-term future of a protected structure. Whilst each proposal will be dealt with on its merits, it is considered that this policy allows for sufficient flexibility in dealing with Protected Structures and therefore no rezoning is recommended on this basis.

Issue no. 4

The submission supports the inclusion of Greenland Villas as Proposed Protected Structures.

Opinion

Please refer to Volume 2 of this Report, which deals with the Record of Protected Structures.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Duggans Architects & Engineers
on behalf of Terry Connolly & Sean Cassidy

Issue no. 1

The submission refers to an area of land located to the east of the Rosses Point village and requests that the lands in question retain their residential zoning in accordance with Section 3.8 of the current CDP. The submission also requests the amendment of the development limit and Plan limit in the Rosses Point Mini-Plan to encompass both the lands within their ownership and the cluster of adjacent dwelling houses.

The submission refers to support from local residents on the basis that the proposed development will provide improved road access and pedestrian access to this cluster of dwelling houses and will enable access to the public sewer (attached petition is noted in this regard).

The submission also refers to the planning history on the site and makes mention of a current planning application on the subject site for 7 no. dwelling houses.

Opinion

The zoning of some of these lands for residential uses in accordance with the current CDP is noted. However, notwithstanding this zoning, planning permission was refused for a residential development under PL 06/103. Whilst the submission notes that refusal was on grounds that included excessive density and inappropriate siting and design, it should be noted that grounds for refusal were also substantially based on the significant distance of the site from the built-up area of Rosses Point, the established character and pattern of development in the area, the absence of adequate pedestrian links to the built-up area of Rosses Point, and other traffic safety concerns given the location of the lands outside the 50kph speed limit zone. These concerns still apply in relation to the requested zoning.

Having regard to the above concerns, the subject lands were not only omitted from the development limit and zoned lands, but not even included within the area to be covered by the Rosses Point mini-plan. Accordingly, no mini-plan zoning or other provisions apply to these lands in accordance with the Draft CDP.

As outlined in the 'introduction' (above), there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to existing levels of residential vacancy and the extent of land already zoned for residential use. There is no requirement to zone existing houses for residential use as their existing residential status will always be recognised.

Notwithstanding the local support in the Ballyweelin area for the provision of improved access and services, it is not considered appropriate to promote the achievement of such an improvement on the basis of inappropriately located housing development. Furthermore, such an improvement could also be achieved in the absence of a residential zoning.

Having regard to the above concerns it is recommended that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Issue no. 2

The submission requests that the section titled "Infrastructure" in the Rosses Point Mini-Plan be amended to include consideration of the provision of adequate road access, footpath access and services to the Ballyweelin area either by private or public means.

Opinion

Having regard to the opinion outlined in reponse to issue 1 above, (i.e. that these lands should not be zoned and should not be included within the Plan area), it is accordingly considered that the Plan should not include reference to the provision of improved access and services to the Ballyweelin area by public or private means.

Having regard to the detached location of these lands, it is considered that such a policy would set an undesirable precedent for the uneconomic provision of services in rural areas throughout the county. Notwithstanding this however, any particular proposal for the provision of improved access or services to the Ballyweelin area by the private sector shall be dealt with on its merits and without any associated link to the zoning of lands for residential use. There is no requirement to amend the Draft CDP in this regard.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 102

8 September 2010

James J. Healy

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the development limit of Rosses Point be extended in a westerly direction to include the coastal lands between the road and Deadman's Point. The submission points out that these lands include the yacht club, the Sea Scout base, a swimming area and a scenic walk. The submission suggests that the lands be zoned for open space, natural resources, sports and playing fields and general recreational purposes. The submission argues that all visitors from Sligo and beyond should be catered for in the future plans for the village.

Opinion

The lands referred to are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. Recreational facilities and community facilities such as those outlined in the submission can be accommodated in the Buffer Zone and in this context it is considered that the lands in question are already appropriately zoned and protected.

It is noted that the submission also recommends a 'natural resource' reservation. The objective of such a zoning designation is to protect all known unworked mineral deposits. Given that this is significantly at variance with the remainder of the submission's requests it may have been requested in error. In any case such a zoning would be inappropriate for this sensitive coastal location.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 116

8 September 2010

Gary McGinty
on behalf of Michael Monaghan

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the Plan Limit and the Development Limit of Rosses Point, as defined in the Draft Mini Plan, be extended eastwards to include lands at Ballyweelin (marked as site 116.1 on map 1). The submission argues that the lands in question are urban in character, have existing public lighting and footpaths, are within easy walking distance of the village and have strong commercial, social, cultural and educational links with Rosses Point. It is stated that the lands are not affected by any sensitivity or archaeological designations and that their inclusion within the development limit would constitute infill development.

Opinion

Whilst the subject lands do not exactly correspond with those outlined in submission no. 80, they are generally consistent and accordingly the same issues and concerns in relation to the detached location of these lands apply. It is not considered that the lands are urban in character. The lands are located outside the 50kph speed limit zone and do not have adequate footpath and public lighting services.

Therefore it is again recommended that the Plan Limit and Development Limit should not be extended to include the subject lands.

Issue no. 2

The submission refers to one of the fields included in the overall lands (marked as 116.2 on map 1) and requests that the eastern portion of this field be zoned for a one off house for a family member.

Opinion

It is not recommended that the lands be included within the mini-plan area and therefore no zoning provisions should apply. Notwithstanding this issue, it is considered inappropriate to zone any lands on the basis of individual housing requirements. The response to Submission no. 114 in Volume 1 of this Report covers the issue of one-off housing policy and this is considered appropriate to deal with any rural housing needs that may arise.

Issue no. 3

In relation to another of the fields included in the overall lands (marked as 116.3 on map 1), the submission requests that these lands be zoned for low density housing. It is argued that the development of these lands would allow for improved access to the Ballyweelin area through the provision of a proposed link road to the existing public road with much improved alignment and pedestrian/cycle access.

Opinion

These lands were the subject of a refused planning application under PL 06/103 and were dealt with in response to submission no. 80. Accordingly the same concerns still apply notwithstanding any possible improvements to access and services, and it is recommended that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Issue no. 4

The submission requests that the existing position of the eastern speed limit be moved further westwards to a point 50m east of the Ballyweelin /Lower Rosses Road junction.

Opinion

There would appear to be some error in relation to the request that the eastern speed limit be moved westward as this would not include the subject lands within the speed limit. In any case the eastern speed limit currently coincides with the eastern Development Limit of Rosses Point and therefore is considered to be in the correct location. Moving the position of the speed limit is therefore not recommended.

Issue no. 5

The submission requests that the existing village sewerage facilities be extended eastwards to allow for the connection of the existing built-up area of Ballyweelin.

Opinion

It is possible that properties in Ballyweelin could be connected to public sewerage facilities but this would be pending advancement of the Rosses Point-Cregg-Ballyweelin scheme which will be subject to funding approvals. However, this should not be considered any basis for the zoning of lands at Ballyweelin.

Issue No. 6

The submission recommends that where there is a conflict between the provisions of the Draft County Development Plan and the Draft Ballincar Mini-Plan with regard to incompatible local zonings and countywide designations, it should be explicitly stated that the provisions of the Ballincar Mini-Plan will be given precedence.

Opinion

The Draft Rosses Point mini-plan is part of the Draft CDP and the zoning contained within the mini-plan, which is zoning under the CDP, was informed by the overall county-wide designations within the Draft CDP. There is no conflict between the provisions of the Rosses Point Mini-Plan and those contained within the general policy volume of the Draft CDP, and in this context there is no requirement for a statement in respect of the precedence of the Mini-Plan over the rest of the CDP.

Issue No. 7

This issue relates to the Draft County Development Plan rural housing policy and recommends that specific reference toward “sympathetic consideration for sons and daughters of landholders should they wish to erect a dwelling house” be inserted into the CDP. It also recommends that any reference to ‘farmers’ should be replaced with ‘landowners’ in relation to this policy.

Opinion

The issue of rural housing policy is dealt with in response to submission no. 114 and it is considered that the proposed amendments in this regard adequately cover this issue.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 133

8 September 2010

Lewis J. Rhatigan Architect
on behalf of the Conway Family

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that an area of land located to the north of the proposed development limit be zoned in whole or in part for 'residential uses'. The submission recognises the "significant residential overhang in the property market" but argues that the zoning of virtually no additional lands for residential uses within the context of the Mini-Plan is an "over-reaction to the present situation and is unwarranted".

The submission goes on to argue that the designation of Rosses Point as a Principal Gateway Satellite within the context of the Draft CDP means that its development is of crucial importance to the development of Sligo as a gateway city. In this context it is stated that the long term viability of Rosses Point must be secured against the backdrop of an ageing population in the higher socio-economic groupings. It is argued that the demographic and socio-economic profile of the village requires expansion in order to underpin existing services and to facilitate the expansion of the range of services and amenities available.

It is also stated that the strict restriction imposed on the zoning of residential lands has the impact of supporting property values resulting in even further gentrification of the village. The submission also argues that the position of the lands referred to represents a central location in close proximity to the village core thereby complying with the principle of sequential development as espoused in Section 3.4.1. of the Draft CDP.

Opinion

As outlined in the 'introduction' above, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential development having regard to the existing level of residential vacancy and the extent of land already zoned for residential use. The subject lands extend to 4.6 hectares and would have the potential to provide at least 55 houses, which would accommodate a further population of approximately 121 persons (approximately 15% of the existing population).

Furthermore, there are serious concerns in relation to the suitability of the subject lands. The lands are extremely elevated and visible over a wide surrounding area, and are also located in close proximity to the coastline which is designated as Visually Vulnerable. The 'buffer zone' objective has been proposed on these lands in order to protect the amenities of the area from the effects of urban sprawl. This is particularly important given the close proximity and inter-visibility between the subject lands and the adjoining coastal, touristic and recreational amenities.

The lands also adjoin areas to the north which are designated as Natural Heritage Area and Special Area of Conservation. Accordingly there would be serious concerns in relation to the nature conservation objectives of these sites.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

4. Responses to submissions relating to villages located in the Sligo-Strandhill Electoral Area

Submissions relating to Ransboro Mini-Plan

Submission no. 6

29 July 2010

Declan McCabe, VHA Architects
on behalf of Stephen Gilligan

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that an area of land to the south of Ransboro (marked as site 6.1 on map 1) be zoned for low density residential development. It is stated that this would help in providing sites for one-off housing.

Opinion

Ransboro is categorised as a Secondary Gateway Satellite and has a recommended population level of 120 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 97 persons for Ransboro in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a population growth of 23.7% compared to the growth rate of 10% experienced between 2002 and 2006.

During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Ransboro will be met through a combination of one-off housing and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. In this regard the Draft CDP estimates that just approximately 1 hectare of additional land would be required to meet new residential development requirements during the plan period. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Ransboro Mini-Plan including a combination of infill sites zoned for residential development and the zoning of 1.3 hectares of greenfield land for mixed uses (which includes residential development).

Furthermore it is considered that, given the predominantly rural nature of Ransboro, a significant extent of rural-generated housing needs will be met in the 'buffer zone' and the wider surrounding rural area. Accordingly there is no requirement to zone additional land for residential development.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the 'buffer zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area.

This is of particular importance given the archaeological sensitivity of Ransboro area and the presence of existing recorded monuments on these lands. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

The submission refers to the accommodation of one-off housing in the area. In this regard it should be noted that a residential zoning is not required for the accommodation of one-off houses and any rural-generated housing proposal could be accommodated in the 'buffer zone' subject to compliance with

the details outlined in response to submission no. 114 in this report, as well as all other standard development management criteria.

Furthermore, it would appear that Mr Gilligan's landholding extends to the crossroads and therefore includes land already proposed to be zoned for 'mixed uses' in the Draft CDP. Again, residential development could be accommodated at this location subject to standard assessment and development management criteria.

Issue no. 2

In return for the above zoning request, it is stated that the landowner will make adjoining lands to the east (marked as site 6.2 on map 1) available for the provision of a temporary treatment plant for the Ransboro area.

Opinion

At the outset it should be stated that any request for residential zoning should stand on its own merits and should not be considered on the basis of any other zoning that is proposed "in return".

There is an existing small scale wastewater treatment plant in Ransboro which was designed to serve 6 no. properties only. As outlined in section 9.3.1 of the Draft CDP (Table 9.B), there are no plans for the provision or extension of further such facilities. Policy P-WW-5 (section 9.3 of the Draft CDP) also states that the provision of such infrastructure will only be pursued where it would be consistent with the Core Strategy and Settlement Structure of the County.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the 'buffer zone' is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area.

This is of particular importance given the archaeological sensitivity of Ransboro area and the presence of existing recorded monuments on these lands. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

Recommendation

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submission no. 58

7 September 2010

Brian McHugh

Issue no. 1

The submission states that there are no "GAA grounds" in Ransboro and that the playing pitch in question should be correctly referred to as "Ransboro Community Park", having been developed by the Ransboro Development Association for the use of any community group in the parish.

Opinion

The reference to the "GAA grounds" was intended to reflect the apparent current use and not ownership. However, there is no objection to amending the plan by referring to the lands as "Ransboro Community Park".

Recommendations

- A. In **Chapter 39**, under the heading **Community Facilities**, the reference to the “the GAA grounds” shall be omitted and replaced by reference to “**Ransboro Community Park**”.
- B. **Objective 39.5 B.**, under the heading **Community Facilities**, shall be amended to omit reference to “**GAA facilities**”, which shall be replaced by reference to “**Ransboro Community Park facilities**”.

5. Responses to submissions relating to villages located in the Tobercurry Electoral Area

Submission relating to Aclare Mini-Plan

Submission no. 17

27 August 2010

Nathy Walsh

Issue no. 1

This submission concerns a plot of land on the north eastern fringe of Aclare village. Mr. Walsh states that he purchased this plot of land in the year 2000 with the intention of developing it for housing. Outline permission for 4 houses was previously granted on part of this site in 1997. The submission requests that the development limit be extended to enable the lands to be developed for residential purposes and not to be zoned 'Buffer Zone' as currently proposed.

Opinion

It is noted that the subject lands once had the benefit of outline permission which expired in 2002. Since that time there have not been any subsequent planning applications.

Aclare is categorised as a Village Supporting the Rural Community and has a recommended population level of 180 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 101 persons for Aclare in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 78%, compared to the 2% drop in population recorded for the wider Aclare area between 2002 and 2006.

During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Aclare will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. The Draft CDP estimates that there are 14 vacant residential units in Aclare, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 30 persons.

Therefore the remaining housing land requirement is estimated at 1.83 hectares. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Aclare mini-plan including 2.27 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential uses and 0.8 hectares of greenfield land for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 33 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 74 persons.

The Draft CDP therefore already provides for a potential total additional population of approximately 104 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which if permitted, would more than double the estimated current population. Accordingly, there is clearly no justification for the zoning of additional land for residential development.

These lands are proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft CDP. The aim of the Buffer Zone is to consolidate settlements within the development limit, to safeguard land for future expansion and to protect the natural amenity and conservation value of the surrounding area. The zoning of the lands for such uses would therefore conflict with these aims and would encourage further sporadic development at this location.

Apart from one-off housing, this side of the road has remained free from development. The subject lands are located outside the speed limit zone and there is no public footpath linking the site to the village centre. Public lighting services are also substandard. Accordingly there would be concerns in relation to traffic hazard and pedestrian safety if the subject lands were zoned for residential development.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above, it is considered that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Banada Mini-Plan

Submission no. 130

8 September 2010

Sean Owens, Banada Development Agency Ltd.

This submission on behalf of Banada Development Agency Ltd., a community company established to serve the needs of its locality, outlines the history of the company and lists its many varied and worthwhile accomplishments in providing facilities and developing services for people of Banada and Tourlestrane, including housing for the elderly, a primary healthcare centre, landscaped parklands, refurbishment of the ball alley and restoration of Banada Graveyard.

Issue no. 1

Banada Development Agency Ltd. intend to carry out further developments to establish Banada as a tourist centre, namely a water sports training centre, a tourist reception building, a craft shop and museum for Banada Lace and have requested that some of the lands in their ownership be zoned for 'mixed uses' to accommodate such development.

Opinion

The lands referred to in this submission are located adjacent to the River Moy and are within the boundaries of the designated River Moy Special Area of Conservation (site code 002298). It is an objective of the Planning Authority to discourage any development that could damage or destroy sites of national or international importance designated for their wildlife/habitat significance. It is considered that the proposed rezoning would conflict with this objective and accordingly the subject lands are not considered suitable for the development. Their 'buffer zone' status in the Draft CDP should therefore be retained.

It is important to state that the planning authority recognise the valuable work carried out by this agency and indeed would support the proposals included in this submission if a suitable alternative site could be identified. In this regard it is considered that the proposed 'mixed uses' area, as contained in the Draft CDP, should be extended to the south in order to offer potential for the accommodation of such facilities.

Recommendation

The **Banada zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 3, by extending the proposed 'mixed uses' area to the south and thereby changing the zoning objective of the lands annotated as **130a** from 'buffer zone' to 'mixed uses'.

Submissions relating to Cloonacool Mini-Plan

Submission no. 29

2 September 2010

John Brennan

Issue no. 1

The submission requests that the development limit of the plan be extended in a southerly direction to include lands adjacent to the River Moy. It is stated that the lands previously had the benefit of planning permission for a multiple housing development which was only partially completed and has since lapsed. It is stated that the lands are convenient to the necessary utilities and services infrastructure.

Opinion

It should be noted that the planning permission on this site was due to expire in 2007. The planning authority then granted an extension of duration of the planning permission until December 2008. Notwithstanding this extension however the development was still not completed.

The lands referred to in this submission are located adjacent to the River Moy and are within the boundaries of the designated River Moy Special Area of Conservation (site code 002298). It is an objective of the Planning Authority to discourage any development that could damage or destroy sites of national or international importance designated for their wildlife/habitat significance. It is considered that the proposed rezoning would conflict with this objective and accordingly the subject lands are not considered suitable for development.

Cloonacool is categorised as a Village Supporting the Rural Community and has a recommended population level of 130 for the year 2017 in accordance with the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development Plan. The Draft Plan estimates a population of 103 persons for Cloonacool in 2010. The recommended population level would therefore represent a growth rate of 26%, compared to a rate of 9% experienced in the wider Cloonacool area between 2002 and 2006.

During the 2011-2017 period, it is envisaged that the residential requirements of Cloonacool will be met through a combination of existing vacant properties, existing properties under construction and new housing development on lands zoned for residential development. It is estimated that there are 10 residential units that are vacant / under construction in Cloonacool, which would have the potential to accommodate approximately 22 persons.

Therefore the remaining housing land requirement is estimated at 0.69 hectares. This requirement has already been met in the Draft CDP with the Cloonacool mini-plan including 0.54 hectares of greenfield land zoned for residential uses and 0.6 hectares of greenfield land for mixed uses (which includes residential development). These lands would have the potential to provide at least 11 houses, which would accommodate an additional population of approximately 24 persons.

The Draft CDP therefore already provides for an additional population of 46 persons (i.e. the combined capacity of vacant residential units and zoned lands), which would represent a 44% increase on the estimated current village population.

It should be noted that the majority of the greenfield lands proposed to be zoned 'mixed uses' were in the ownership of Mr Brennan and planning permission on the lands was granted for a mixed residential and commercial development which included 8 residential units.

Having regard to the concerns outlined above it is recommended that the subject lands should not be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendations

No change to the Draft CDP is recommended on foot of this submission.

Submissions relating to Culfadda Mini-Plan

There were no submissions received in relation to the Draft Culfadda mini-plan.

Manager's Supplementary Recommendation

MSR-38

Issue

On review of the Draft Culfadda mini-plan, it is noted that the site identified for 'business and enterprise' uses (i.e. site ENT1) is very elevated. It is considered that development of the site would seriously detract from the amenities of the area and that the area should therefore be zoned as 'buffer zone'.

It should be noted that the Culfadda mini-plan includes a significant amount of other lands which are zoned for 'mixed uses'. It is considered that these lands have adequate potential to provide for business and enterprise development.

Recommendations

- A.** The **Culfadda zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 1, by changing the zoning objective for the lands outlined as **MSR-38a** from 'business and enterprise' to 'buffer zone'.
- B.** The **Culfadda objectives map** should be amended as shown on map 2, by removing the site designated as ENT1.
- C.** **Section 29.4** should be amended as follows (text to be deleted in **red**, text to be added in **blue**):

Promote the provision of small-scale business and enterprise units on **site ENT-1 suitable sites**, accommodating uses that are compatible with surrounding **residential and community uses development**.

The development of site ENT-1 should provide a well designed façade and landscaping, particularly when viewed from the north-eastern approach to the village.

Submissions relating to Gorteen Mini-Plan

There were no submissions received in relation to the Draft Gorteen mini-plan.

Manager's Supplementary Recommendation

MSR-39

Issue

On review of the Draft Gorteen mini-plan it is noted that some existing commercial areas along the main street have not been included within the 'mixed uses' area. Whilst the existing commercial uses will always be acknowledged, it is nonetheless considered that such areas should be included within the 'mixed uses' area in the interests of consistency.

Recommendation

The Gorteen zoning map should be amended as shown on map 1, by changing the zoning objective for the lands outlined as MSR 1 from 'residential uses' to 'mixed uses'.

Submissions relating to Tourlestraun Mini-Plan

Submission no. 131

8 September 2010

Sean Owens

Issue

The submission requests that additional lands in Tourlestraun be included within the proposed development limit and be zoned for 'mixed uses'. The intention of this request is to accommodate further development by Banada Tourlestraun Housing Association who developed the nearby *Corpus Christi Village*, which provides housing for the elderly of South Sligo.

Opinion

It is noted that the northern portion of these lands is proposed to be zoned as 'mixed uses' and the southern portion is proposed to be zoned as 'buffer zone' in accordance with the Draft mini-plan. However, it is considered appropriate to cater for the expansion of the community-based housing scheme and associated activities that have been developed to date by Banada Toorlestraun Housing Association. Therefore there would be no objection to the extension of the development limit to include all of the subject lands.

However, given the nature of this organisation and their stated intentions, it is considered that 'community facilities' would be a more appropriate zoning category for these lands as this would accommodate the proposed housing along with associated community facilities.

Furthermore it is considered that the lands between the subject site and the existing Corpus Christi development to the east should also be zoned as 'community facilities' in order to facilitate potential extensions and links between both plots of land.

Recommendation

The **Tourlestraun Zoning map** should be amended as shown on map 2, by changing the zoning objective of the lands marked as **131a** from 'buffer zone' to 'community facilities'.

Manager's Supplementary Recommendation

MSR-40

Issue

On receipt of an internal submission from the SCC Housing Section, it was noted that part of the SCC lands in Collooney have been proposed as 'buffer zone' in the Draft CDP. In light of the intentions for these lands, it is considered that the subject lands should be zoned for residential uses.

Recommendation

The Collooney zoning map should be amended as shown on map 3, by changing the zoning objective for the lands outlined as MSR 40 from 'buffer zone' to 'residential uses'. The development limit should be extended accordingly to include the subject lands.