FEHILY TIMONEY

CONSULTANTS IN ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & PLANNING

COLLINSTOWN PARK PAVILION DEVELOPMENT

Appropriate Assessment Screening Report

Prepared for:

South Dublin County Council

Comhairle Contae Átha Cliath Theas
South Dublin County Council

Date: **September 2024**

Document No:
P24077-FT-EBD-XX-RP-EN-0001

Core House, Pouladuff Road, Cork, T12 D773, Ireland

T: +353 21 496 4133 | E: info@ftco.ie

CORK | DUBLIN | CARLOW

www.fehilytimoney.ie

APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT SCREENING REPORT

REVISION CONTROL TABLE, CLIENT, KEYWORDS AND ABSTRACT

User is responsible for Checking the Revision Status of This Document

Rev. No.	Description of Changes	Prepared by:	Checked by:	Approved by:	Date:
	Draft	SB/NSC	RM/RD	BG	27/09/2024

Client: South Dublin County Council

Keywords: Appropriate Assessment (AA), AA Screening, Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, European (Natura 2000) sites, Collinstown Park Pavilion Development

Abstract: This document is to inform the Competent Authority in carrying out their statutory obligations relating to the Habitats Directive requirement for Appropriate Assessment for plans and projects seeking consent. Appropriate Assessment is required under Article 6 (3) of the Habitats Directive for any project or plan that may give rise to significant effects on a European (Natura 2000) site.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. INTRODUCTION

Fehily Timoney and Company (FT)[1] was commissioned by South Dublin County Council to prepare an Appropriate Assessment Screening Report (AASR) for the Collinstown Park Pavilion Development. The proposed site is located in Collinstown Park, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, east of Collinstown Road.

This report presents an examination of whether the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) and is based on best available scientific knowledge. This report has been prepared to inform the competent authority in completing their statutory obligations in relation to Appropriate Assessment, as required by Article 6(3) under Council Directive 92/43/EEC (Habitats Directive).

1.1 Legislative Context

Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (Habitats Directive) provides legal protection for habitats and species of European importance. The Directive requires that where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European Site, while not directly connected with or necessary to the nature conservation management of the site, it will be subject to 'Appropriate Assessment' to identify any implications for the European site in view of the site's Conservation Objectives. Specifically, Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive states:

> *"6(3) Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site (Natura 2000 sites) but likely to have significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to Appropriate Assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives. In the light of the conclusions of the assessment of the implications for the site and subject to the provisions of paragraph 4, the competent national authorities shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned and, if appropriate, after having obtained the opinion of the general public."*

The competent authority must carry out a screening for appropriate assessment to assess, in view of best scientific knowledge, if the proposed project, individually or in combination with another plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site. If it cannot be excluded, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed project, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, will have a significant effect on a European site, an appropriate assessment of its implications for the European Site(s) in view of the Site's conservation objectives is required to be carried out.

The provisions of Article 6(3) do not apply where the proposed plan or project is 'connected with or necessary to the management of the site'. In this case, the proposed project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of any European site(s).

[1] Details on the contributors to this report are provided in Appendix 1.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 Guidance

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the following guidance:

- Assessment of plans and projects in relation to Natura 2000 sites - Methodological guidance on Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. Commission Notice (2021) Brussels, 28.9.2021 C(2021) 6913 final (European Commission, 2021)
- Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland: Guidance for Planning Authorities. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Dublin (2009, updated 2010) (Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, 2010)
- Managing Natura 2000 sites. The provisions of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. (European Commission, 2019)
- Interpretation Manual of European Union Habitats. Version EUR 28. (European COmmission, 2013)
- OPR Practice Note PN01 Appropriate Assessment Screening for Development Management, (Office of the Planning Regulator, 2021)

1.2.2 Process

The process of determining the likelihood of significant effects from a proposed project on European sites is an iterative process centred around a Source-Pathway-Receptor model. In order for an effect to be established, all three elements of this mechanism must be in place. The absence of one of the elements of the mechanism is sufficient to conclude that a potential effect cannot occur.

- Source(s) – e.g., pollutant run-off, noise, removal of vegetation, etc;
- Pathway(s) – functional link, or ecological pathway e.g., groundwater connecting to nearby qualifying wetland habitats; and,
- Receptor(s) – the qualifying habitats and species of European sites and ecological resources supporting those habitats/species.

In the context of this report, a source is any identifiable element of the proposed project that is known to interact with the receiving environment. A receptor is the Qualifying Interests (QI)[2] for an SAC or Special Conservation Interests (SCI)[3] for an SPA or an ecological feature that is known to be utilised by the QI/SCI. In practice, the term Qualifying Interests also applies to SCIs (and is used in this document for simplicity). A pathway is any connection or link between the source and the receptor.

[2] SACs are areas designated under the Habitats Directive to conserve habitats listed in Annex I of the Directive and plant and animal species listed in Annex II. Collectively these are referred to as the 'Qualifying Interests' or 'QIs' of the SAC.
[3] SPAs are sites classified under the Birds Directive to protect rare or vulnerable bird species listed in Annex I to the Directive as well as regularly occurring migratory species and wetlands. Wetland habitats that support internationally important populations of migratory birds may be coastal or inland. Collectively, these species and habitats are referred to as the 'Special Conservation Interests' of the SPA.

The assessment commences with a description of the project, along with a description of the receiving environment and the associated sources for impacts to the receiving environment. All elements of the project are presented including the project location and existing baseline environment. The type of impacts that are likely due to the project (Source) are identified having regard to the spatial and temporal scale of the project, resource requirements and likely emissions. These sources are then used to define the zone of influence (ZoI) of the project.

The guidance (European Commission, 2021)', states that in identifying European sites (Natural 2000 sites), which may be affected by the project, the following should be identified:

- Any European sites geographically overlapping with any of the actions or aspects of the plan or project in any of its phases, or adjacent to them;
- Any European sites within the likely zone of influence of the plan or project. European sites located in the surroundings of the plan or project (or at some distance) that could still be indirectly affected by aspects of the project, including as regards the use of natural resources (e.g., water) and various types of waste, discharge or emissions of substances or energy;
- European sites whose connectivity or ecological continuity can be affected by the plan or project.

The zone of influence of a proposed project is therefore the geographical area over which it could affect the receiving environment in a way that could have potential effects on the Qualifying Interests of a European site. The practice note (Office of the Planning Regulator, 2021)states that the Zone of Influence must be established on a case-by-case basis using the Source-Pathway-Receptor (S-P-R) framework and not by arbitrary distances (such as 15 km). This report sets out the detailed rationale for the identification of relevant European sites within the ZoI based on the sources of impacts arising from the proposed project. Subsequently, an assessment is undertaken with respect to potential connectivity (Pathways) to European Sites and their qualifying interests/special conservation interests are identified.

The potential for in-combination effects with other plans and projects is examined in Section 2, having regard to the identified impacts of the project along the ecological pathways identified to European sites.

The likelihood of significant effects of the European Sites within the ZoI is examined having regard to the sensitivity of the site with pathways for impacts associated with the project on its own and in combination with other plans and projects.

Having regard to the European Commission Communication on the Precautionary Principle (European Commission, 2021) the:

> *"absence of scientific evidence on the significant negative effect of an action cannot be used as justification for approval of this action. When applied to Article 6(3) procedure, the precautionary principle implies that the absence of a negative effect on Natura 2000 sites has to be demonstrated before a plan or project can be authorised. In other words, if there is a lack of certainty as to whether there will be any negative effects, then the plan or project cannot be approved."*

Where significant effects are determined to be likely, or where there is uncertainty regarding the likelihood of significant effects, the project will be required under law to be subjected to Appropriate Assessment.

This AA screening is based on best scientific knowledge and has utilised ecological expertise. In addition, a detailed online review of published scientific literature was conducted. This included a detailed review of the National Parks and Wildlife Website including mapping and available reports for relevant sites and in particular sensitive qualifying interests/special conservation interests described and their conservation objectives.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Site Description

The overall site is 0.0447 hectares (ha) in extent and is located in Collinstown Park, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, east of Collinstown Road. The overall area consists of several playing pitches, walking and cycling routes, play areas, and some trees and remnant hedgerows within the park. The park is surrounded by urban environment.

The site is located within WFD Catchment Liffey and Dublin Bay and WFD Sub catchment Liffey_SC_090. There are no watercourses located in the immediate surrounding area. The Grand Canal is 1.2 km to the south and the River Liffey is 2.1 km to the north of the proposed development.

2.2 Project Description

The proposed development will consist of the following:

- One single storey pavilion building consisting of six individual team changing rooms each with one WC area, one club storage area, and one plant room, all with individual access.
- 1 No. Storage facility for equipment with a Plant room.
- Ancillary landscaping works adjacent to the pavilion building
- All associated ancillary works in adjacent areas including but not limited to foul & surface water drainage and utility supplies
- Installation of CCTV for security

The proposed development forms part of the South Dublin County Council Pavilion Project, which aims for the replacement of existing container units used for changing/storage space at parklands in the area.

2.3 Existing Environment

Ecological surveys were undertaken at the site by Shane Somers in August 2024.

The surrounding area was described as Amenity Grassland (GA2) which is mainly comprised of playing pitches with some mature trees and patches of unmown grass throughout. There is a children's playground (over grass), outdoor gym (over artificial substrate) and a fenced dog park (grass) on the west side of the park in the vicinity of the proposed pavilion. The northwest section of the park consists of scattered trees and parkland (WD5: featuring ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), and sessile oak (*Quercus petraea*)) as well as a treeline (WL2: featuring ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), oak (*Quercus* sp.), birch (*Betual* sp.), and sycamore (*Acer pseudoplanatus*)) and hedgerow (WL1; featuring ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), brambles (*Rubus fruticosus*), and hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*)). There are linear broadleaved woodlands (WD1) in the eastern section of the park featuring pedunculate oak (*Quercus robur*), hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), downy birch (*Betual pubescens*), and brambles (*Rubus fruticosus*).

There are no existing records of Annex I protected species but the following Annex II protected species were found in the surrounding area of the proposed development:

- Otter (Lutra lutra) was last recorded in 1980 in the surrounding area of this site. Considering the distance from the nearest waterbody and the lack of recorded otters since, there is no threat to this protected species.
- Freshwater White-clawed Crayfish (Austropotamobius pallipes; 2019) was recorded in the surrounding area, however, there are no watercourses in the ZoI of the proposed development that will cause disturbance to this protected species.

3. SCREENING ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

Consideration is given to whether the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect upon any European sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The approach to identifying European sites which have potential for significant effects due to the proposed development follows the approach set out in the AA screening practice note (Office of the Planning Regulator, 2021).

3.2 Identification of relevant European sites using Source-Pathway-Receptor model

The practice note (Office of the Planning Regulator, 2021) states that the Zone of Influence (ZoI) must be established on a case-by-case basis using the Source-Pathway-Receptor model. In this regard, consideration is given to the nature and extent of the proposed development and the characteristics of the immediate environment along with the consideration of potential pathways for connectivity to European sites, which are assessed having regard to available Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping and ecological site walkover.

3.2.1 Study Area/ZoI

As per CIEEM guidelines (2018)[4], the study area for the proposed development has been defined having regard to the spatial and temporal scale of potential biophysical changes in the environment which might occur as a result of the development and throughout its lifetime. As such the study area extends beyond the footprint of the works and considers potential direct and indirect links to sensitive receptors of European sites. In particular, the following was considered:

- Impacts on habitats - the potential for biophysical change by disturbance/damage/ degradation is taken as the footprint of the works (including any site clearance) plus 10m beyond (based on Ryan Hanley, 2014)[5].
- The IAQM Guidance[6] prescribes a potential dust ZoI for dust impacts from construction and demolition works as 50m from site boundaries and 250m from site entrance.
- For groundwater dependant terrestrial ecosystems additional consideration is given to potential for hydrological/hydrogeological impacts and as such a potential for biophysical change is considered 250m beyond works areas as per SEPA guidelines[7].

In defining the potential zone of influence for the proposed development of species, the following guidelines were referred to:

[4] CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine version 1.2. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester
[5] Ryan Hanley (2014b) Stage 1: Appropriate Assessment Screening Methodology for the Maintenance of Arterial Drainage Schemes. Prepared by Ryan Hanley Consulting Engineers on behalf of the Office of Public Works
[6] IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction (Institute of Air Quality Management, January 2024 (Version 2.2)
[7] Scottish Environment Protection Agency (2014) Land Use Planning System SEPA Guidance Note 31. Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems.

- The potential disturbance zone for birds beyond the footprint of the proposed development was considered having regard to Cutts et al (2013)[8] and was defined as 500m;
- The NRA (2008) Guidelines for the Treatment of Otters prior to the Construction of National Road Schemes notes a 150m potential disturbance zone for otter. As such the study area included the proposed development site plus a 150m buffer.

The Proposed Development will result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.0447 hectares of Amenity Grassland (GA2) habitat. The habitats within and adjacent to the proposed development which are within the ZoI for dust effects and/or habitat damage or degradation are not Annex I type habitats and are not part of any European site. Additionally, there are no GWDTEs within 250m ZoI of the proposed development.

The proposed development site is located wholly outside of any European site. The closest Natura 2000 sites to the development are Rye Water Vally/Carton SAC (7.1 km), Glenasmole Valley SAC (9.2 km), South Dublin Bay SAC (11.1 km), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (11.1 km), Wicklow Mountains SAC (11.7 km), Wicklow Mountains SPA (13.4 km), North Dublin Bay SAC (14.2 km), and North Bull Island SPA (14.2 km).

[8] Cutts N, Hemingway K and Spencer J (2013). The Waterbird Disturbance Mitigation Toolkit Informing Estuarine Planning and Construction Projects. Produced by the Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (IECS). Version 3.2.

While the proposed development is outside of European Sites, consideration is given to the potential for lands within disturbance and impact ZoIs (as described above) to support the qualifying interests / special conservation interests of these nearby European sites (see Table 3-1: Source-Pathway-Receptor Assessment). In this regard, an assessment is made as to whether there could be landscape[9] or ecological connectivity[10] to any European site. Consideration was given to existing records for qualifying features in the locality of the proposed development and an assessment of the potential for mobile qualifying features of European sites to use the lands within the disturbance and impact ZoIs.

Additionally, in determining potential for SPA birds to be within the disturbance zone of the proposed development the 'Scottish Natural Heritage (2016) Guidance on Assessing Connectivity with Special Protection Areas (SPAs)' was referred to for the core foraging ranges of SPA birds and a 15km range was adopted for consideration.

Table 3-1: Source-Pathway-Receptor Assessment

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
Rye Water Vally/Carton SAC (001398)	Petrifying springs with tufa formation (*Cratoneurion*) [7220], *Vertigo angustior* (Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail) [1014], *Vertigo moulinsiana* (Desmoulin's Whorl Snail) [1016]	7.09	The qualifying features of this SAC are located a considerable distance outside of the ZoI of the proposed development (as described in Section 3.2.1) and, as per Irish Wildlife Manual 55[11], the species for which the SAC is designated have specific micro-habitats to which they are confined, and which do not correlate with any of the habitats within the ZoI of the proposed development. As such, there are no pathways for effect.	N

[9] Landscape connectivity is a combined product of structural and functional connectivity, i.e. the effect of physical landscape structure and the actual species use of the landscape (Kettunen et al. 2007)

[10] Connectivity is defined as a measure of the functional availability of the habitats needed for a particular species to move through a given area. Examples include the flight lines used by bats to travel between roosts and foraging areas, or the corridors of appropriate habitat needed by some slow colonising species if they are to spread (CIEEM, 2018).

[11] Moorkens, E.A. & Killeen, I.J. (2011) Monitoring and Condition Assessment of Populations of Vertigo geyeri, Vertigo angustior and Vertigo moulinsiana in Ireland. Irish Wildlife Manuals, No. 55. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage and Gaeltacht, Dublin, Ireland.

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
Glenasmole Valley SAC (001209)	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites) [6210], Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinion caeruleae*) [6410], Petrifying springs with tufa formation (*Cratoneurion*) [7220]	9.17	Due to the small scale of the proposed development and the significant distance of this SAC beyond the ZoI of the proposed development on habitats, there is no pathway for effects on the QI.	N
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140], Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210], *Salicornia* and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310], Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]	11.09	There are no watercourses within the ZoI of the proposed development connected to this European site. Due to the small scale of the proposed development and the significant distance of this SAC beyond the ZoI of the proposed development, there is no pathway for effects on the QI.	N
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (004024)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla hrota*) [A046], Oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*) [A130], Ringed Plover (*Charadrius hiaticula*) [A137], Grey Plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*) [A141], Knot (*Calidris canutus*) [A143], Sanderling (*Calidris alba*) [A144], Dunlin (*Calidris alpina*) [A149], Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*) [A157], Redshank (*Tringa totanus*) [A162], Black-headed Gull (*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*) [A179], Roseate Tern (*Sterna dougallii*) [A192], Common Tern (*Sterna hirundo*) [A193], Arctic Tern (*Sterna paradisaea*) [A194], Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]	11.09	The SPA is outside of the ZoI of the proposed development and as such there is no potential for direct impacts on the SPA. However, consideration is given to potential for landscape/ecological connectivity as described in Section 3.2.1. The bird species present within this European site are coastal bird species. With the exception of Light-bellied Brent Goose, the birds of the SPA have short foraging ranges, e.g. Dunlin and Plover species have core ranges of 500 m and 3 km, respectively (source: Scottish Natural Heritage, 2016).	N

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
			As such these species would be unlikely to forage the 11.09 km towards the proposed development lands. Additionally, the lands surrounding the proposed development (which are within the 500m disturbance zone for birds) are not suitable foraging or roosting habitats for these birds, which use coastal areas foraging on mudflat and intertidal habitats. Light-bellied Brent Goose has a larger foraging range (assumed as up to 15 km, having regard to foraging ranges of other geese as prescribed in SNH, 2016) and as such its foraging range could theoretically overlap with the disturbance zone of the proposed development. However, as per the SPA Conservation Objectives supporting Document (NPWS, 2014, Version1) the foraging preference of Light-bellied Brent Goose is intertidal areas with Eelgrass (*Zostera* sp.), algae, and saltmarsh plant species. The lands within the disturbance ZoI for birds does not provide suitable foraging habitat. Additionally, the SPA population of Light-bellied Brent Goose roosts on Bull Island. As the proposed development is not a suitable destination for foraging or roosting, there is no pathway for effect.	

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
Wicklow Mountains SAC (002122)	Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (*Littorelletalia uniflorae*) [3110], Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds [3160], Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* [4010], European dry heaths [4030], Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060], Calaminarian grasslands of the *Violetalia calaminariae* [6130], Species-rich *Nardus* grasslands, on siliceous substrates in mountain areas (and submountain areas, in Continental Europe) [6230], Blanket bogs (* if active bog) [7130], Siliceous scree of the montane to snow levels (*Androsacetalia alpinae* and *Galeopsietalia ladani*) [8110], Calcareous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8210], Siliceous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8220], Old sessile oak woods with *Ilex* and *Blechnum* in the British Isles [91A0], *Lutra lutra* (Otter) [1355]	11.72	Due to the small scale of the proposed development and the significant distance of this SAC beyond the ZoI for habitats from the proposed development, there is no pathway for effects on the QI. The potential disturbance zone of Otter is 150 m. As the development site is located 11.72 km away from this SAC, no pathway for direct effects exists. Additionally, there are no habitats outside of the SAC and within 150m of the proposed development that could be suitable for otter i.e. no watercourses.	N
Wicklow Mountains SPA (004040)	Merlin (*Falco columbarius*) [A098], Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus*) [A103]	13.14	The potential disturbance zone of birds beyond the footprint of the proposed development is defined as 500 m. As per SNH, 2016 Merlin have a core foraging range of 5 km and Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus*) 2km . As such, no pathways for effects exist.	N

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140], Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210], *Salicornia* and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310], Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae*) [1330], Mediterranean salt meadows (*Juncetalia maritimi*) [1410], Embryonic shifting dunes [2110], Shifting dunes along the shoreline with *Ammophila arenaria* (white dunes) [2120], Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130], Humid dune slacks [2190], *Petalophyllum ralfsii* (Petalwort) [1395]	14.21	There are no watercourses within the proposed development site connected to this European site. Due to this, the distance of the development site from the SAC, and the scale of the development, no pathway of effect exists.	N
North Bull Island SPA (004006)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla hrota*) [A046], Shelduck (*Tadorna tadorna*) [A048], Teal (*Anas crecca*) [A052], Pintail (*Anas acuta*) [A054], Shoveler (*Anas clypeata*) [A056], Oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*) [A130], Golden Plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*) [A140], Grey Plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*) [A141], Knot (*Calidris canutus*) [A143], Sanderling (*Calidris alba*) [A144], Dunlin (*Calidris alpina*) [A149], Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*) [A156], Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*) [A157], Curlew (*Numenius arquata*) [A160], Redshank (*Tringa totanus*) [A162], Turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*) [A169], Black-headed Gull (*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*) [A179], Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]	14.21	The SPA is outside of the ZoI of the proposed development and as such there is no potential for direct impacts on the SPA. However, consideration is given to potential for landscape/ecological connectivity as described in Section 3.2.1. The bird species present within this European site are coastal bird species. With the exception of Light-bellied Brent Goose, the birds of the SPA have short foraging ranges, e.g. Dunlin, curlew and Plover species have core ranges of 500 m to 3 km, (source: Scottish Natural Heritage, 2016). As such these species would be unlikely to forage the 14.2 km towards the proposed development lands.	N

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying Interest/Special Conservation Interest	Distance from development (km)	Source - Pathway - Receptor Assessment	Considered further in screening Y/N
			Additionally, the lands surrounding the proposed development (which are within the 500m disturbance zone for birds) are not suitable foraging or roosting habitats for these birds, which use coastal areas foraging on mudflat and intertidal habitats. Light-bellied Brent Goose has a larger foraging range (assumed as up to 15 km, having regard to foraging ranges of other geese as prescribed in SNH, 2016) and as such its foraging range could theoretically overlap with the disturbance zone of the proposed development. However, as per the SPA Conservation Objectives supporting Document (NPWS, 2014, Version1) the foraging preference of Light-bellied Brent Goose is intertidal areas with Eelgrass (*Zostera* sp.), algae, and saltmarsh plant species. The lands within the disturbance ZoI for birds does not provide suitable foraging habitat. Additionally, the SPA population of Light-bellied Brent Goose roosts on Bull Island. As the proposed development is not a suitable destination for foraging or roosting, there is no pathway for effect.	

3.3 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

The guidance (European Commission, 2021) notes that the significance of the effects will vary depending on factors such as the magnitude of impact, the type, extent, duration, intensity, timing, probability, in-combination effects and the vulnerability of the habitats and species concerned. European site(s) identified are now examined for the potential for likely significant effects.

Table 3-2: Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

(a) Identify all potential direct and indirect impacts that may have an effect on the conservation objectives of a European site, taking into account the size and scale of the project under the following headings:	
Impacts:	**Possible Significance of Impacts: (duration/magnitude etc.)**
Construction phase	There will be minor loss of Amenity Grassland (GA2) habitat as a result of the construction phase of development. The surrounding habitats will remain as they are. There will be a localised increase in noise and dust for the duration of the works.
Operational phase	There will be no impact to the surrounding area during the operational phase as the development is replacing an already present structure used for the same purpose.
In-combination/Other	Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive requires that: "Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives". It is therefore required that the likely significant effects of the proposed project are considered in-combination with any other plans or projects within the zone of influence. The consideration of in-combination effects with other plans or projects focused on the sources of impacts identified for the proposed development and ecological pathways identified in Table 3-1. As there are no meaningful pathways for effects identified with respect to European sites - given the nature of the habitats on the site and the distance from relevant SPA locations for SCI species. There are no further considerations required as the S-P-R model has been completed with no potential effects that could arise from the proposed project.
(b) Describe any likely changes to the European sites:	
	As per Section 3.2 there are no European sites affected by the construction or operational phases of the proposed development.
(c) Are 'mitigation' measures necessary to reach a conclusion that likely significant effects can be ruled out at screening?	
☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**	

3.4 Screening Conclusion

The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report concludes that, given the scale and nature of the potential sources, there are no likely significant effects identified to any European sites. This process has considered potential effects which may arise during all phases of the proposed project. Through an assessment of the pathways for effects and an evaluation of the sources for impacts, taking account of the processes involved and the distance of separation from European sites, it has been evaluated that there are no likely significant effects on the qualifying interests, special conservation interest or the conservation objectives of any designated European site.

FEHILY TIMONEY

DESIGNING AND DELIVERING
A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

APPENDIX 1

Statement of Authority

Name	Role	Biography
Shannon Burke	Report Author	Shannon is a Project Ecologist with 5 years' experience in coastal ecology and the environmental sector. She has undertaken a number of field surveys including habitat, vegetation, and freshwater invertebrate surveys. Shannon graduated from University College Dublin with a first-class honor in Plant Biology (BSc Hons.). She has also been awarded a PhD in Environmental Science studying the carbon stock and sequestration rates in Ireland's saltmarshes and is pending graduation.
Rita Mansfield	Report Reviewer	Rita is a Principal Ecologist and Project Manager with 20 years' previous experience as a technical lead within the environmental and planning services sector. She specialises in statutory consent and environmental assessment for large scale public infrastructure projects in the energy, water (including flood relief schemes) and transport sectors. She is a qualified ecologist with experience in environmental impact assessment, planning applications (conventional and strategic infrastructure development), climate adaptation, Appropriate Assessment, foreshore licensing, Water Framework Directive, integrated catchment management, and stakeholder engagement. Rita has held numerous licences under the Wildlife Act and Habitats Directive for disturbance to species which included mitigation (e.g. construction of artificial otter holt, bat exclusion). Rita has provided advice on ecological / environmental design to various private and public sector clients, which included the development of contract requirements for Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) for contracts tendered using both the PPP and D&B.

FEHILY TIMONEY

DESIGNING AND DELIVERING A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

www.fehilytimoney.ie

Cork Dublin Carlow