

# **REPORT TO INFORM STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SCREENING**

---

**FOR  
PROPOSED AMENDMENT No. 8**

**TO THE  
CHERRYWOOD SDZ PLANNING SCHEME 2014 (AS AMENDED)**

**for: Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council**

County Hall  
Marine Road  
Dún Laoghaire



**by: CAAS Ltd.**

1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
24-26 Ormond Quay Upper  
Dublin 7



**MAY 2021**

# Table of Contents

<b>Section 1</b>	<b>Introduction and Terms of Reference</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Introduction .....	1
1.2	Legislative Context for the SEA Screening Requirement.....	1
1.3	Summary of and Reasons for the Proposed Amendment .....	1
<b>Section 2</b>	<b>SEA Screening</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction .....	3
2.2	AA Screening.....	3
2.3	SEA Screening Analysis .....	3
2.4	Schedule 2A.....	7
<b>Section 3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>12</b>

# Section 1 Introduction and Terms of Reference

## 1.1 Introduction

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council has prepared Proposed Amendment No. 8 to the Cherrywood Strategic Development Zone (SDZ) Planning Scheme 2014 in accordance the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The Proposed Amendment must be screened for the need to undertake Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Screening is the process for determining whether a particular plan - or amendment to a plan - other than those for which SEA is mandatory, would be likely to have significant environmental effects, and would thus warrant SEA.

A determination as to whether SEA is or is not required for the Proposed Amendment must be undertaken. This report has been prepared by CAAS on behalf of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council in order to help inform the SEA determination.

The Cherrywood SDZ Planning Scheme 2014 was subject to full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and to Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening. These processes, throughout which the environmental authorities were consulted, facilitated the mitigation of potential environmental effects.

The seven previous Amendments to the Scheme were found not to require full SEA or Stage 2 AA.

## 1.2 Legislative Context for the SEA Screening Requirement

SEA is the formal, systematic evaluation of the likely significant environmental effects of implementing a plan or programme - or amendment to a plan - before a decision is made to adopt it. Screening is the process for deciding whether a particular plan - or amendment to a plan - other than those for which SEA is mandatory, would be likely to have significant environmental effects, and would thus warrant SEA.

The Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) requires An Bord Pleanála to determine whether SEA is or is not required. Such a determination is required to take account of relevant criteria set out in Schedule 2A '*Criteria for determining whether a plan is likely to have significant effects on the environment*' of the Planning and Development (SEA) Regulations 2004 (as amended).

This report has been prepared by CAAS on behalf of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council in order to help inform the SEA determination.

## 1.3 Summary of and Reasons for the Proposed Amendment

Amendment No. 8 to the Cherrywood Planning Scheme seeks to increase the Building Heights in Cherrywood at certain locations. This review of the building heights was carried out in response to SPPR 3 (Part B) of the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

It was also considered an appropriate time to carry out a review of the residential densities in the approved Planning Scheme, having regard to the Apartment Guidelines 2018, noting that some additional height could be accommodated in the Planning Scheme area and also noting that the residential densities in the Draft Planning Scheme were higher than those currently in the approved Planning Scheme, noting that the Planning Scheme was drafted during an economic downturn which particularly impacted on the construction sector.

Updates have also been made to Appendix E of the Planning Scheme which relates to Hydrogeology in the Planning Scheme area with particular reference to 2 no. Tuffa Spring formations. Since the adoption of the Planning Scheme extensive site investigations have been carried out in relation to Tuffa Spring No. 5 and it

Report to inform SEA Screening for Proposed Amendment No. 8 to the  
Cherrywood SDZ Planning Scheme 2014 (as amended)

is important that this updated information is included in the Planning Scheme to inform the future development of sites within the protection zone of this Tuffa Spring.

For clarity, the Proposed Amendment document, and this Screening document, takes account of Amendment No. 7 of the Cherrywood Planning Scheme 2014 (as amended) - Beckett Road Re-alignment and Ancillary Amendments - as approved by An Bord Pleanála on the 14<sup>th</sup> of April 2021, ABP Case Number: ABP-308753-20.

## Section 2 SEA Screening

### 2.1 Introduction

This section examines whether each part of the Proposed Amendment would be likely to have significant environmental effects (and thus would warrant the undertaking of SEA).

This examination takes account of relevant criteria set out in Schedule 2A '*Criteria for determining whether a plan is likely to have significant effects on the environment*' of the SEA Regulations (as amended) (see Section 2.4).

### 2.2 AA Screening

Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening must also be undertaken on the Proposed Amendment and a determination must be made regarding whether there is a need, or not, to undertake Stage 2 AA on the Proposed Amendment. AA is an impact assessment process concerning European Sites - these sites have been designated or proposed for designation by virtue of their ecological importance.

The Proposed Amendment is also accompanied by a report to inform AA Screening. The findings of this report are that the Proposed Amendment to the Cherrywood Strategic Development Zone Planning Scheme 2014 (as amended) will not give rise to any effect on the ecological integrity of any European sites, alone or in combination with any other plans, programmes, projects etc. Consequently, it is advised that a Stage 2 AA is not required to be undertaken for the Proposed Amendment.

### 2.3 SEA Screening Analysis

Table 2.1 examines whether each part of the Proposed Amendment would be likely to have significant environmental effects (and thus would warrant the undertaking of full SEA).

The examination takes account of relevant criteria set out in Schedule 2A '*Criteria for determining whether a plan is likely to have significant effects on the environment*' of the SEA Regulations, as amended (see Section 2.4).

The full range of environmental effects<sup>1</sup>, including cumulative effects are considered by this assessment.

---

<sup>1</sup> These include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects.

Table 2.1 SEA Screening

Amendment Component(s)	Description (refer to Proposed Amendment document for full details)	SEA Screening Considerations
<p><b>Height and Density</b></p>	<p>Amendment No. 8 to the Cherrywood Planning Scheme seeks to increase the Building Heights in Cherrywood at certain locations. This review of the building heights was carried out in response to SPPR 3 (Part B) of the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities.</p> <p>It was also considered an appropriate time to carry out a review of the residential densities in the approved Planning Scheme, noting that some additional height could be accommodated in the Planning Scheme area and also noting that the residential densities in the Draft Planning Scheme were higher than those currently in the approved Planning Scheme, noting that the Planning Scheme was drafted during an economic downturn which particularly impacted on the construction sector.</p> <p>Proposed Amendments to Height and Density include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A review of the building heights</b> in the Cherrywood Planning Scheme and proposals to alter these building heights where appropriate.</li> <li>• <b>A review of the density ranges</b> in the Cherrywood Planning Scheme in light of the building height review, Apartment Guidelines 2018 and proposed amendments and changes to development quanta where appropriate.</li> <li>• <b>A review of policy</b> in the Planning Scheme in relation to <b>Residential Development, Urban Form, Skyline</b> to support the changes proposed to density and building height.</li> <li>• <b>Amendments and additions to Section 2.9 Building Heights</b> including the deletion of Table 2.11 and associated footnote, the addition of new Section 2.9.1 "Criteria for Assessing Building Height in the Planning Scheme Area" and the addition of additional supporting text allowing for greater flexibility in roof design and architectural expression.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed Amendments to Height and Density are interrelated.</p> <p>By amending the detail in the Scheme relating to heights and densities, the Proposed Amendment would contribute towards the overall development of the Strategic Development Zone and associated effects that have been identified by the SEA for the existing Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive effects include contributions towards: sustainable mobility (arising from a high public transport and non-motorised mode share and a high percentage of internal sustainable mode trips between the residential, employment, education and leisure uses within Cherrywood and), including associated interactions with energy usage and greenhouse gas and other emissions to air; and contributions towards the protection and management of various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage, architectural heritage and exposure to noise levels).</li> <li>• Potential adverse (if unmitigated) environmental effects include those relating to various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage and exposure to noise levels). However, these effects have already been identified, assessed and mitigated (where relevant) by the SEA undertaken on the existing Planning Scheme.</li> </ul> <p>A technical report undertaken to inform the amendment has assessed visual impacts and makes a range of recommendations that have been integrated into the Proposed Amendment that will, in combination with the existing provisions of the Scheme, ensure that the Proposed Amendment will not significantly impact upon important views and prospects. Applicants will still be required to submit a visual impact assessment for planning applications to clearly demonstrated that the protected views are not impacted upon. This is a requirement of Section 2.11 Views and Vistas of the Cherrywood Planning Scheme and is listed as one of the criteria under Section 2.9.1 "Criteria for Assessing Building Height in the Planning Scheme Area", which is proposed to be inserted into the Planning Scheme document as part of the Amendment. Residual effects on views or prospects will not be significant considering the protection of these elements.</p> <p>Various other amendments are proposed to Proposed Development (PD) in Cherrywood objectives from Chapter 2 including those that would further contribute towards the urban form and height objectives, and associated mitigatory interactions with sustainable mobility and visual and cultural heritage impacts, that are already provided for by the Scheme. Guidance has been integrated into the Proposed Amendment to ensure that it will not result in significant environmental effects arising from microclimate and sunlight/daylight/shadow issues – see PD 12 "Sustainability, Microclimate and Sunlight/Daylight/Shadow Analysis" and associated Appendix I.</p> <p>The Proposed Amendment does not increase the number of dwellings and the population to be accommodated within the SDZ to the extent that it would result in exceedances in infrastructural capacity.</p> <p>The 2012 Draft Planning Scheme provided for a maximum number of c. 10,073 dwellings with a maximum residential population of c. 25,000 persons (at a household size of 2.5). The economic downturn combined with a revised CSO household size of 2.7 persons influenced the content of the Scheme that was approved in 2014, which provided for a maximum number of 8,786 dwellings with a maximum residential population of c. 24,000 persons. Proposed Amendment No. 8 would increase the maximum number of dwellings to c. 10,500 dwellings with a maximum residential population of c. 26,000 persons (at a household size of 2.5, incorporating a decline to take account of wider demographic trends, for example lower fertility rates, an aging population and the coming on stream of new homes).</p>

Amendment Component(s)	Description (refer to Proposed Amendment document for full details)	SEA Screening Considerations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Amendments to Map 2.3 Building Heights</b> indicating where additional height may be accommodated and showing the remaining 5 school sites where the max height is now proposed to increase to 4 floors.</li> <li>• <b>An increase in Class 1 Open space from 29.7 ha to 32.5 ha</b> as indicated under Table 5.1: Main Classification of Open Space, under Chapter 5 of the Planning Scheme. This reflects the projected increase in the maximum residential population in the Planning Scheme area by circa 9% as a result of the density review.</li> <li>• And associated amendments.</li> </ul>	<p>Although the amendment does propose increases to dwelling numbers and population, the changes proposed to the Scheme in this regard are within the environmental envelope of effects originally presented by the SEA Environmental Report for the Draft Planning Scheme that was placed on public display in 2012.</p> <p>The changes would further contribute towards green infrastructure provisions under the Scheme (increase in Class 1 Open Space), including synergistic effects with regard to ecological connectivity, sustainable mobility, sustainable urban drainage and flood risk management.</p> <p>Regarding local education infrastructure, it is proposed to increase the building heights on four out of the six school sites in Cherrywood. School provision was not decreased following the decrease in dwelling numbers and population between Draft Planning Scheme in 2012 and approved Scheme in 2014. The proposed increase in height would allow for an increase in the capacity of these primary and post primary school sites if required.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure planned for the SDZ has the capacity to serve the quanta of development proposed under the original Draft Scheme (c. 10,000 dwellings and c. 350,000 sq. m of High Intensity Employment uses) and therefore it is not considered that the increases to dwelling numbers and populations described in the scheme would be likely to have significant environmental effects arising from increases numbers of journeys.</p> <p>Provisions already contained in the Draft Planning Scheme will ensure that any increase in impacts on water services infrastructure (including surface water/wastewater infrastructure) would be mitigated so as not to be significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All development must achieve a maximum run off of 1 litre per second per hectare, demonstrated as part of planning applications and conditioned as part of any granted permissions.</li> <li>• Development of the SDZ is dependent on upgrade of Vartry – this upgrade is being progressed and is due for completion in Q3 2021 and the increase in population can be served by the upgrade.</li> <li>• Waste water will be treated at the Shanganagh Waste Water Treatment Plant, which currently has c. 59,965 population equivalent spare capacity (Irish Water, 2020). Collection pipes have already been laid throughout the Plan area.</li> </ul> <p>Taking all of the above into account, it is not considered that the changes proposed would be likely to result in significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is noted that with regard to dwelling numbers and maximum residential population, it is most likely that the theoretical numbers presented above for Proposed Amendment No. 8, are higher than what is the likely outcome in given that a number of sites already have permission granted on them. When the number of dwellings granted on these sites are added to the maximum residential quanta on the remaining sites which have no permissions granted on them, the maximum yield in the Planning Scheme would stand at c. 10,109 dwellings if Proposed Amendment No. 8 is approved, c. 36 more dwellings than were considered in the 2012 Draft Planning Scheme.</p>

Amendment Component(s)	Description (refer to Proposed Amendment document for full details)	SEA Screening Considerations
<b>Tufa Springs</b>	Amendments to Appendix E : Phase 1 Hydrogeology Assessment of the Cherrywood SDZ to include the results of a hydrogeological study carried out on behalf of the DLRC by JBA Consulting in relation to the Catchment Sensitivity Zone of Tuffa Spring No. 5 and the addition of supporting policy for the development of sites within this Catchment Sensitivity Zone in Development Area 1 Lehaunstown, Development Area 4 Domville and Development Area 8 Tully	<p>Tufa Springs are already protected under the Planning Scheme<sup>2</sup>. Changes are proposed to Appendix E, which relates to Hydrogeology in the Planning Scheme area with particular reference to 2 no. Tuffa Spring formations. Since the adoption of the Planning Scheme extensive site investigations have been carried out in relation to Tuffa Spring No. 5 referenced in the Scheme documents</p> <p>It is proposed to include this updated information in the Planning Scheme to order to ensure that it informs the future development of sites within the protection zone of this Tuffa Spring. It is considered that these changes will further contribute towards the protection of the springs that is already contributed towards by the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>By amending the detail in the Scheme relating to Tufa Springs, the Proposed Amendment would contribute towards the overall development of the Strategic Development Zone and associated effects that have been identified by the SEA for the existing Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive effects include contributions towards: sustainable mobility (arising from a high public transport and non-motorised mode share and a high percentage of internal sustainable mode trips between the residential, employment, education and leisure uses within Cherrywood and), including associated interactions with energy usage and greenhouse gas and other emissions to air; and contributions towards the protection and management of various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage, architectural heritage and exposure to noise levels).</li> <li>• Potential adverse (if unmitigated) environmental effects include those relating to various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage, architectural heritage and exposure to noise levels). However, these effects have already been identified, assessed and mitigated (where relevant) by the SEA undertaken on the existing Planning Scheme.</li> </ul> <p>Taking all of the above into account, it is not considered that the changes proposed would be likely to result in significant environmental effects.</p>

<sup>2</sup> For example, GI 61, which is proposed to be amended as follows "Ensure the protection of calcareous (tufa) springs and the area surrounding them by having no net effect **significant impact** on the hydrogeological and other physical conditions on which these springs rely. Any Planning Application that is located within the hydrogeological catchment of these areas as outlined in the protection zone map of the Hydrogeological Study in Appendix E will have to be accompanied by evidence of how this will be achieved. Collection of hydrogeological data may be required ~~in some cases~~ to prove that there will be no effect **significant impact** on these features."



## 2.4 Schedule 2A

### PART 1

#### **1. *The characteristics of the plan having regard, in particular, to: the degree to which the plan sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources***

By amending the detail in the Plan relating to heights, densities and Tuffa Spring, the Proposed Amendment would contribute towards the overall development of the Strategic Development Zone and associated effects that have been identified by the SEA for the existing Scheme:

- Positive effects include contributions towards: sustainable mobility (arising from a high public transport and non-motorised mode share and a high percentage of internal sustainable mode trips between the residential, employment, education and leisure uses within Cherrywood and), including associated interactions with energy usage and greenhouse gas and other emissions to air; and contributions towards the protection and management of various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage, architectural heritage and exposure to noise levels).
- Potential adverse (if unmitigated) environmental effects include those relating to various environmental components (including habitats, species, ecological connectivity, water quality/status, soil, flood risk management, visual sensitivities, archaeological heritage, architectural heritage and exposure to noise levels). However, these effects have already been identified, assessed and mitigated (where relevant) by the SEA undertaken on the existing Planning Scheme.

#### **Heights and Densities**

A technical report undertaken to inform the amendment has assessed visual impacts and makes a range of recommendations that have been integrated into the Proposed Amendment that will, in combination with the existing provisions of the Scheme, ensure that the Proposed Amendment will not significantly impact upon important views and prospects. Applicants will still be required to submit a visual impact assessment for planning applications to clearly demonstrate that the protected views are not impacted upon. This is a requirement of Section 2.11 Views and Vistas of the Cherrywood Planning Scheme and is listed as one of the criteria for under Section 2.9.1 "Criteria for Assessing Building Height in the Planning Scheme Area", which is proposed to be inserted into the Planning Scheme document as part of the Amendment. Residual effects on views or prospects will not be significant considering the protection of these elements.

Various other amendments are proposed to Proposed Development (PD) in Cherrywood objectives from Chapter 2 including those that would further contribute towards the urban form and height objectives, and associated mitigatory interactions with sustainable mobility and visual and cultural heritage impacts, that are already provided for by the Scheme. Guidance has been integrated into the Proposed Amendment to ensure that it will not result in significant environmental effects arising from microclimate and sunlight/daylight/shadow issues – see PD 12 "Sustainability, Microclimate and Sunlight/Daylight/Shadow Analysis" and associated Appendix I.

The Proposed Amendment does not increase the number of dwellings and the population to be accommodated within the SDZ to the extent that it would result in exceedances in infrastructural capacity.

The 2012 Draft Planning Scheme provided for a maximum number of c. 10,073 dwellings with a maximum residential population of c. 25,000 persons (at a household size of 2.5). The economic

downturn combined with a revised CSO household size of 2.7 persons influenced the content of the Scheme that was approved in 2014, which provided for a maximum number of 8,786 dwellings with a maximum residential population of c. 24,000 persons. Proposed Amendment No. 8 would increase the maximum number of dwellings to c. 10,500 dwellings) with a maximum residential population of c. 26,000 persons (at a household size of 2.5, incorporating a decline to take account of wider demographic trends, for example lower fertility rates, an aging population and the coming on stream of new homes).

Although the amendment does propose increases to dwelling numbers and population, the changes proposed to the Scheme in this regard are within the environmental envelope of effects originally presented by the SEA Environmental Report for the Draft Planning Scheme that was placed on public display in 2012.

The changes would further contribute towards green infrastructure provisions under the Scheme (increase in Class 1 Open Space), including synergistic effects with regard to ecological connectivity, sustainable mobility, sustainable urban drainage and flood risk management.

Regarding local education infrastructure, it is proposed to increase the building heights on four out of the six school sites in Cherrywood. School provision was not decreased following the decrease in dwelling numbers and population between Draft Planning Scheme in 2012 and approved Scheme in 2014. The proposed increase in height would allow for an increase in the capacity of these primary and post primary school sites if required.

Transport infrastructure planned for the SDZ has the capacity to serve the quanta of development proposed under the original Draft Scheme (c. 10,000 dwellings and c. 350,000 sq. m of High Intensity Employment uses) and therefore it is not considered that the increases to dwelling numbers and populations described in the scheme would be likely to have significant environmental effects arising from increases numbers of journeys.

Provisions already contained in the Draft Planning Scheme will ensure that any increase in impacts on water services infrastructure (including surface water/wastewater infrastructure) would be mitigated so as not to be significant:

- All development must achieve a maximum run off of 1 litre per second per hectare, demonstrated as part of planning applications and conditioned as part of any granted permissions.
- Development of the SDZ is dependent on upgrade of Vartry – this upgrade is being progressed and is due for completion in Q3 2021 and the increase in population can be served by the upgrade.
- Waste water will be treated at the Shanganagh Waste Water Treatment Plant, which currently has c. 59,965 population equivalent spare capacity (Irish Water, 2020). Collection pipes have already been laid throughout the Plan area.

Furthermore, it is noted that with regard to dwelling numbers and maximum residential population, it is most likely that the theoretical numbers presented above for Proposed Amendment No. 8 are higher than what is the likely outcome in given that a number of sites already have permission granted on them. When the number of dwellings granted on these sites are added to the maximum residential quanta on the remaining sites which have no permissions granted on them, the maximum yield in the Planning Scheme would stand at c. 10,109 dwellings if Proposed Amendment No. 8 is approved, c. 36 more dwellings than were considered in the 2012 Draft Planning Scheme.

## **Tufa Springs**

Tufa Springs are already protected under the Planning Scheme<sup>3</sup>. Changes are proposed to Appendix E, which relates to Hydrogeology in the Planning Scheme area with particular reference to 2 no.

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, GI 61, which is proposed to be amended as follows "Ensure the protection of calcareous (tufa) springs and the area surrounding them by having no net effect **significant impact** on the hydrogeological and other physical conditions on which these springs rely. Any Planning Application that is located within the hydrogeological catchment of these areas as outlined in the protection zone map of the Hydrogeological Study in Appendix E will have to be accompanied by evidence of how this will be achieved. Collection of hydrogeological data may be required ~~in some cases~~ to prove that there will be no effect **significant impact** on these features."

Tuffa Spring formations. Since the adoption of the Planning Scheme extensive site investigations have been carried out in relation to Tuffa Spring No. 5 referenced in the Scheme documents

It is proposed to include this updated information in the Planning Scheme to order to ensure that it informs the future development of sites within the protection zone of this Tuffa Spring. It is considered that these changes will further contribute towards the protection of the springs that is already contributed towards by the Planning Scheme.

### **Consultation**

Taking the above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3 into account, arising from the degree to which the Planning Scheme (as amended) and Proposed Amendment set a framework for projects and other activities, the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

### **2. *The characteristics of the plan having regard, in particular, to: the degree to which the plan influences other plans, including those in a hierarchy***

The Proposed Amendment will not influence higher level plans; lower level plans comprise non-statutory plans relating to mitigation that may be required by the current Scheme such as Construction Management Plans, Traffic and Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

Taking the above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3 into account, arising from the degree to which the Planning Scheme (as amended) and Proposed Amendment influence other plans, the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

### **3. *The characteristics of the plan having regard, in particular, to: the relevance of the plan for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development***

The Cherrywood Planning Scheme, as amended, - to which the Proposed Amendment relates - has undergone SEA. This process integrated environmental considerations into the Strategic Development Zone and found that it contributes to environmental protection and management and sustainable development.

Taking the above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3 into account, arising from the relevance of the Planning Scheme (as amended) and Proposed Amendment for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development, the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

### **4. *The characteristics of the plan having regard, in particular, to: environmental problems relevant to the plan***

Environmental problems arise where there is a conflict between current environmental conditions and legislative targets.

Through its provisions relating to environmental protection and management, the existing Planning Scheme, as amended, contributes towards ensuring that environmental conditions do not get worse and, where possible, it contributes towards its amelioration.

Taking the above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3 into account, arising from environmental problems relevant to the Planning Scheme (as amended) and Proposed Amendment, the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

**5. The characteristics of the plan having regard, in particular, to: the relevance of the plan for the implementation of European Union legislation on the environment (e.g. plans linked to waste-management or water protection)**

The Planning Scheme, as amended, relates to the land use sector and has undergone SEA. This process integrated considerations with regard to EU and national legislation on the environment into the Scheme, including those relating to the waste management and the Water Framework Directive.

Taking the above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3 into account, arising from the relevance of the Planning Scheme (as amended) and Proposed Amendment for the implementation of European Union legislation on the environment, the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

**PART 2**

**1. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**2. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the cumulative nature of the effects**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**3. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the transboundary nature of the effects**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**4. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the risks to human health or the environment (e.g. due to accidents)**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**5. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected)**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**6. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to:**

- a) special natural characteristics or cultural heritage;**  
The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).
- b) exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values, and;**  
The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).
- c) intensive land-use.**  
The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

**7. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, European Union or international protection status**

The Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects (see responses under Schedule 2A Part 1 above and the examination of the various parts of the Proposed Amendment provided under Section 2.3).

## Section 3 Conclusion

SEA Screening is the process for determining whether a particular plan - or amendment to a plan - other than those for which SEA is mandatory, would be likely to have significant environmental effects, and would thus warrant SEA. The purpose of the report is to evaluate the requirement for SEA to be undertaken on Proposed Amendment No. 8 to the Cherrywood Planning Scheme (as amended).

A determination as to whether SEA is or is not required for the Proposed Amendment must be undertaken. This report has been prepared by CAAS on behalf of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council in order to help inform the SEA determination.

The assessment of the Proposed Amendment provided in this report [including against the criteria set out in Schedule 2A of the Planning and Development (SEA) Regulations, as amended] has found that the Proposed Amendment would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects.

As detailed in the Proposed Material Alteration document, if Cherrywood were to be developed significantly beyond 10,500 dwellings, a revised SEA and AA would need to be undertaken, as well as a comprehensive review with regards to the carrying capacity of the physical and social infrastructure to support an emerging sustainable community as well as a comprehensive review of the environmental studies which also underpin and support the current Planning Scheme. The Development Agency Project Team consider that any significant additional increases in development quantum would require extensive engagement with a number of relevant statutory agencies, such as the National Transport Authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland, Department of Education and Skills, Irish Water, National Parks and Wildlife Service, National Monuments Service and Office of Public Works.