



Appendix **3.1 Stakeholder Consultation**

Appendix 3

APPENDIX 3.1 - STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Four stakeholder consultations were completed between July 2020 and February 2023. A number of key stakeholders of the Proposed Scheme were identified and contacted in writing or via email.

These consultations were as follows:

- 08-July-2020: Introduce the Proposed Scheme (Stage 1 Programme) and request feedback into the constraints study.
- 18-September-2020: Request input on the existing environmental constraints identified and inform stakeholders of the Virtual and PCD 1.
- 21-December-2022: Provide summary of options considered and introduced preferred option.
- 28-February-2023: Provide scoping report for review and inform stakeholders of the upcoming Virtual and PCD 2.

A list of stakeholders and response periods are provided in **Apx Table 1**.

Apx Table 1: List of Stakeholders Contacted

Stakeholders	Constraints	PCD 1	Option Selection	PCD 2 and Scoping Report
Department of Agriculture, Food, and the Marine				
Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications ¹				
Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media ²	24/07/2020	14/12/2020		
Department of Public Expenditure and Reform				
Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage ³			21/12/22	03/03/2023
Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport				
Department of Defence				
Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment				
Environment Department – Mayo County Council				
Heritage Department – Mayo County Council			21/02/22	
Planning Department – Mayo County Council		28/09/2020		
Mayo National Road Design Office				
Climate Action Regional Office				
Office of Public Works Head Office	28/09/2020			
An Taisce				
Ballina Chamber of Commerce				
Birdwatch Ireland				

¹ Department name changed on the 29th September 2020 from Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment

² Department name changed on the 30th September 2020 from Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht

³ Department name changed on the 2nd October 2020 from Department of Housing Planning and Local Government

Appendix 3.1

Stakeholders	Constraints	PCD 1	Option Selection	PCD 2 and Scoping Report
BT Ireland				
Bus Eireann				
Coillte	28/09/2020			
Eir				
Enet				
ESB				
Fáilte Ireland	04/08/2020	30/09/2020		14/03/2023
Gas Networks Ireland	13/07/2020			
Geological Survey of Ireland	23/07/2020		24/01/2023	
Inland Fisheries Ireland	29/07/2020		25/01/2023	
Irish Farmers Association (IFA) Galway & Mayo Office				
Irish Rail	22/07/2020			
Uisce Éireann	04/08/2020	21/09/2020	27/01/2023	27/03/2023
Local Authority Waters and Communities Office				
Mayo Local Enterprise Office		7/10/2020		
National Monument Service				
National Museum of Ireland				
National Parks & Wildlife Service (NPWS)				19/04/2023
Northern & Western Regional Assembly				
Road Safety Authority		01/10/2020		
Royal Irish Academy; Committee for Historical Studies				
Siro	10/07/2020		08/02/2023	
Teagasc				
The Arts Council				
The Heritage Council			04/01/2023	20/02/2023
Three		07/10/2020		
TII	20/07/2020		13/01/2023	15/03/2023
Virgin Media		02/10/2020	06/01/2023	09/03/2023
Vodafone				

Appendix 3.1

Stakeholders	Constraints	PCD 1	Option Selection	PCD 2 and Scoping Report
Mayo County Council - Sanitary & Water Section				
Ballina Angling Club				
Moy Boat Club				
Bord Gáis Energy				
Bord na Mona	23/10/2020			
River Moy Trust	16/07/2020			
Irish Creamery Milk Suppliers Association (ICMSA)				
Irish Environmental Network				
Landscape Alliance Ireland				
Marine Institute				
Sustainable Water Network Ireland (SWAN)	16/07/2020			
The National Water Forum (An Forám Uisce)		11/08/2020 and 12/08/2020	03/01/2023	
Water Policy Advisory Committee		01/10/2020		
Met Eireann		22/09/2020		
St. Muredach's Cathedral				
Bishop of Killala				
Ballina Development Community Group				

3.1.1 Project Information Consultation

A summary of stakeholder observations and comments on environmental elements of the Proposed Scheme are provided in **Apx Table 2**. Additional meetings were held with some of the stakeholders to discuss specific aspects of the Proposed Scheme. Further information regarding these meetings are available in the relevant EIAR **Chapters 6-21**.

APPENDIX 3

Apx Table 2: Summary of Stakeholder Consultation Responses Received

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
Bord na Mona (BnM)	BnM have a windfarm in development at Oweninny Bog approx. 20km northwest of Ballina. A section of the windfarm haul route passes through the scheme area. Information to alterations to levels or structures within the scheme area could cumulatively impact the windfarm project.	Chapter 6: Traffic & Transportation Chapter 20: Interactions & Cumulative Effects
Coillte	The Belleek Coillte site is approx. 2km north of the proposed scheme. It could be impacted if water levels were to rise at this site as a result of this scheme. The RPS design team have confirmed that this is highly unlikely and hydrological and hydraulic modelling at detailed design will confirm this.	Chapter 12: Water
Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media⁴	<p>Nature Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed Scheme is within or potentially directly or indirectly affecting the River Moy SAC, the Killala Bay/Moy Estuary SAC and the Killala Bay/Moy Estuary SPA. Any potential for change to hydrological conditions, and the impact of this on riverine and riparian habitats, should be clearly identified and considered. Any watercourse or wetland impacted on should be surveyed for the presence of protected species and species listed on Annexes II and IV of the Habitats Directive, or Annex I of the Birds Directive, including Otters (<i>Lutra lutra</i>), Salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>), Lamprey species and Kingfishers (<i>Alcedo atthis</i>). One of the main threats identified in the Threat Response Plan for Otter is habitat destruction. A 10m riparian buffer on both banks of a waterway is considered to comprise Otter habitat. IFI should be consulted and note publication “<i>Planning for watercourses in the urban environment</i>”. Hard infrastructure proposed as part of the scheme, such as pilings and embankments, will need full consideration in ecological assessments. It is important that the full range of construction works are described. Project details including outline construction management plans (CMPs) need to be provided. <p>Underwater Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend a Project Archaeologist(s) is engaged to oversee and advise on all aspects of the scheme from design through inception to completion. Should be suitably qualified with coastal, riverine, lacustrine and underwater experience. Refer to the Department’s published policy “<i>Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage</i>” (Dúchas The Heritage Service). The Wreck Inventory of Ireland Database lists a number of wrecks for the River Moy, which are subject to statutory protection under section 3 of the 1987 National Monuments (Amendment) Act. Underwater archaeology may be impacted by potential works within the riverbed or adjacent areas. Dredged material dumped on the adjacent riverbanks may hold previously undiscovered archaeological material. Mayo County Council should seek to protect the terrestrial and underwater archaeological heritage from direct damage or indirect impact through ill-considered design and take into account the advice and recommendations of The Heritage & Planning Division and the Underwater Archaeology Unit in the National Monuments Service. 	Chapter 9: Aquatic Biodiversity Chapter 10: Terrestrial Biodiversity Chapter 18: Cultural Heritage

⁴ Department name changed 30th September 2020 from Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any proposed works either above or below ground or above or below water, within the vicinity of a site of known archaeological interest shall not be detrimental to the character of the archaeological site or its setting. • If the works result in a change in water levels near or adjacent to recorded monuments or wrecks, which may be waterlogged, there may be an indirect resultant deterioration of waterlogged archaeological material. • The archaeological assessment to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Monuments in the ownership or care of the State or Local Authority. – Archaeological and Architectural monuments/sites in the Record of Monuments and Places. – Monuments in the Register of Historic Monuments. – Zones of Archaeological Potential in Historic Towns. – Detail both the terrestrial and underwater archaeological heritage of the area including Underwater Archaeological Heritage, including Historic Wrecks. – Previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological sites (including subsurface elements with no visible surface remains and potential sites underwater in rivers, lakes or the sea, that can include wharves, jetties, quays, piers, fish traps, anchorages, bridges, fording points, rockcut steps or sea caves). – Potential sites located in the vicinity of large complexes of sites or monuments. – Present or former wetlands, unenclosed land, rivers or lakes, or the inter-tidal zone. • The Wreck Inventory of Ireland Database, Ports and Harbours Archive, Topographical Files of the National Museum shall be consulted as will relevant historical and local sources. 	
Department of the Housing, Local Government and Heritage	No comment	NA
Fáilte Ireland	<p>Consider impact of Scheme on Tourism and tourism amenities, infrastructure must be considered in light of natural processes and the potential long-term impacts on the heritage value, and tourism value of the area. Consider Fáilte Ireland’s updated “<i>Guidelines on the Treatment of Tourism in an Environmental Impact Assessment</i>”.</p>	Chapter 7: Population
Gas Networks Ireland	Provided mapping of Gas networks present within scheme area.	Chapter 16: Materials Assets Waste & Utilities
Geological Survey of Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The letter included an extensive list of GSI datasets relevant to EIA. • There are County Geological Sites (CGS) in the vicinity of the flood relief scheme, namely that of the River Moy, Co. Mayo (GR 128034, 312458), under IGH theme: IGH14 Fluvial and Lacustrine Geomorphology. A long, lowland river that exhibits excellent meandering and drains a catchment area of over 2000 km² flowing into the Moy River estuary at Ballina. • The proposed FRS should not impact on the integrity of the CGS which is significant as it demonstrates some of the best examples of U-shaped river channel meandering in the country. The geodiversity represented by this site underpins much of the biodiversity associated with the site. If the proposed flood relief scheme is altered, please contact GSI for further information and possible mitigation measures if applicable. 	<p>Chapter 11: Land, Soil, Geology & Hydrogeology</p> <p>Chapter 21: Risk of Major Accidents and Disasters</p>

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geohazards can cause widespread damage to landscapes, wildlife, human property and human life. In Ireland, landslides, flooding and coastal erosion are the most prevalent of these hazards. We recommend that geohazards be taken into consideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The River Moy is a nationally important salmon and trout fishery attracting anglers from throughout Ireland and abroad. The significance of the River Moy as a fishery is confirmed by Ballina’s official designation as the Salmon capital of Ireland. • The River Moy and its Estuary is a migratory route for salmon, sea trout, eel and lamprey into the wider River Moy system. The River Moy Estuary supports a number of fish species including flounder, plaice, sea trout, eel, pollock and whiting and supports a number of charter boats for sea angling. The proposed works must not negatively impact on this fishery. • The proposed works are located in the River Moy SAC which is designated for the protection of Atlantic salmon, white-clawed crayfish and lamprey species and the Killala Bay/ Moy Estuary SAC which is designated for the protection of sea lamprey. • These catchments are under environmental pressure with both the River Moy Estuary, the River Moy and the Knockanelo Stream allocated moderate ecological status in the River Basin Management Plan. This status must be improved to good to comply with the Water Framework Directive. <p>Having reviewed the information provided IFI have the following comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IFI requests that nature-based solution to flooding be prioritised such as rewetting of land and re-establishing connection between the river and its floodplain. Green infrastructure features should be used to attenuate surface water drainage such as the inclusion of swales, permeable paving/car park surfacing and green roofs, as required. 2. Riparian habitat enhancement should be considered where possible. Including the planting of native trees to provide dappled shade can provide shelter from predators, help maintain lower water temperatures during hot weather and improve biodiversity. IFI guidance for planning for watercourses in the urban environment can be viewed at https://www.fisheriesireland.ie/sites/default/files/migrated/docman/IFIUrbnWatercoursesPlanningGuide.pdf 3. “Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas, Water Sensitive Urban Design Best Practice Interim Guidance” should be considered. 4. There must be no discharge of silted waters, cement products, hydrocarbons or otherwise polluted waters into any surface watercourse as a result of the proposed works. “IFI Guidelines on Protection of Fisheries During Construction in and Adjacent to Waters” (IFI,2016) must be complied with. 5. Biosecurity measures must be put in place with no spread of invasive species as a result of the proposed works. A survey of the sites must be carried out to identify and invasive species present. IFI biosecurity protocol can be viewed at https://www.fisheriesireland.ie/sites/default/files/202106/research_biosecurity_biosecurity_for_fieldsurveys_2010.pdf 	<p>Chapter 5: Project Description Chapter 7: Population Chapter 9: Aquatic Biodiversity</p>

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="495 204 1693 256">6. Fish passage for all species present including eel, which is a critically endangered species, must be protected or enhanced where already impeded due to poor culvert design. <li data-bbox="495 264 1693 568">7. River Moy – The proposed flood walls must not prevent access for anglers to the fishery. Pedestrian access to fishery along Bachelors walk and Clare St must be maintained. IFI intends to install a disabled access for angling at the downstream end of the proposed wall on Clare St. and this must be facilitated in the design. Pedestrian and vehicle/boat access to the River Moy must be maintained from Cathedral Road. IFI launch protection vessels from this location which is also utilised by the emergency services and recreational users. Pedestrian and disabled access must be maintained at the ridge pool upstream of the upper bridge, this access is critical to the functioning of the fishery. IFI request that the proposed wall does not exceed the existing rail height at this location. There is also potential to introduce angler access adjacent to the salmon weir on Ridge Pool Road as part of the proposed works. This would improve safety for anglers accessing the fishery. Three, currently unused, pedestrian access points to the fishery exist along Emmet Street. The proposed works must not prevent this access being redeveloped along this stretch in the future. <li data-bbox="495 576 1693 735">8. River Moy – The timing of the proposed works will have a significant impact on the operation of the fishery. While instream works in spawning and nursery areas is limited to between July and September inclusive, to protect spawning and juvenile salmonids this is not the case in the lower section of the River Moy. IFI request that work on this section of the River is limited to the end of September where coffer dam installation is required through to the first of the following April when the coffer dam must be removed to facilitate angling along this valuable stretch of river. <li data-bbox="495 743 1693 1015">9. Quignamanger Stream – Potential suitable habitat for eel. The existing culvert under the Quay road is a barrier to fish movement and impedes water flows in flood conditions. The proposed culvert upgrade must include a replacement culvert which provide passage for any aquatic species present. A significant proportion of the flow within this channel appears to come from a surface water drainage connection approximately 40m upstream of the Quay road culvert. IFI request that all exiting open channel is retained and existing culverts which restrict flood flows and or fish passage are replaced with adequately designed culverts. All the existing open channel must be retained as open channel. The area immediately upstream of the Quay road culvert could be redesigned to facilitate flood flows. This could be done by reprofiling the surrounding area to include a swale or other nature-based solution to accommodate flood flows which will not be facilitated by the culvert upgrade. <li data-bbox="495 1023 1693 1222">10. Brusna River - Provides valuable salmon and trout spawning and nursery habitat. This catchment is under environmental pressure, salmon stocks have declined to below their conservations limit. As a result, this fishery is now closed to angling. The proposed embankment and flood wall is also within the River Moy SAC which is designated for the protection of Atlantic salmon, white-clawed crayfish and lamprey species. The placement of the proposed embankment and flood wall on the downstream bank should be moved back to allow for maximum connectivity between the river and the adjacent floodplain. All existing riparian trees and vegetation must be retained to protect biodiversity and mitigate high water temperatures. <li data-bbox="495 1230 1693 1334">11. Bunree Stream - The physical structure has been significantly altered. IFI request that all exiting open channel is retained as open channel. The channel should be restructured to allow for conveyance or storage of flood flows. This could be done by reprofiling the surrounding area to include a swale, floodplain or other nature-based solution. <li data-bbox="495 1342 1693 1399">12. The following restriction for the timing of any instream work including cofferdam installation, must be adhered to, to minimise the impact on the River Moy fishery and fisheries habitat: 	

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – River Moy - September to April; cofferdams may be put in place in later September to allow work to be carried out from 1st October to 1st April. – River Moy Estuary, Ballina Quay: May to September – Quignamanger – May to September – Bunree Stream – May to September – Brusna River – July to September, in the case of any instream works. – Tullyegan Stream – May to September – Knockanelo Stream – May to September 	
Irish Rail	Railway in Ballina is situated some distance from the River Moy ($\geq 160\text{m}$) and is somewhat elevated from the areas that are a high flood risk alongside the river.	Chapter 16: Material Assets Waste & Utilities
Uisce Éireann	Provided a summary of potential interactions with Uisce Éireann assets and the elements of the project.	Chapter 16: Material Assets Waste & Utilities
Road Safety Authority	No Comment	NA
Siro	There are no networks in the area.	Chapter 16: Material Assets Waste & Utilities
National Parks & Wildlife Service (NPWS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon, Sea lamprey, and Brook lamprey are qualifying interests of the River Moy SAC. Consequently, the department considers that any potential effects on these species, such as changes to their habitats, should be considered as part of the EIAR and Appropriate Assessment (AA) processes. • The department considers that the EIAR and any report done to inform the AA process should consider what effect the proposed flood walls and embankments will have on the hydro-morphology of the river channels and whether such impacts will adversely affect the conservation objectives of Salmon, Sea lamprey, and Brook lamprey, with reference to the relevant attributes and targets for these species⁵. For Sea lamprey and Brook lamprey the Conservation Objectives for the attributes 'Extent and distribution of spawning habitat' and the 'Availability of juvenile habitat' are particularly relevant. Similarly, for Salmon the Conservation Objectives for the attributes 'Number and distribution of redds' and 'Salmon fry abundance' are particularly relevant where changes to flow regime, water depth, and substrate conditions may occur. • The Department notes that both spawning and larval habitat for Sea Lamprey occur in sections of the River Moy in the wider area of Ballina town (NPWS, 2004⁶). The potential for the proposed flood walls, along the River Moy in Ballina, to affect these areas of Sea lamprey habitat should be considered. This may require the use of hydraulic models to illustrate the potential impacts of any proposed flood walls and embankments on the distribution of suitable substrate within the channels. Consideration should be given to how any potential 	Chapter 9: Aquatic Biodiversity Chapter 10: Terrestrial Biodiversity

⁵ NPWS (2016) Conservation Objectives: River Moy SAC 002298. Version 1. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs.

⁶ O'Connor William (2004) A survey of juvenile lamprey populations in the Moy catchment. Irish Wildlife manuals, No. 15. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Dublin, Ireland. 3Heritage, G., 1 and Entwistle, N. Impacts of River Engineering on River Channel Behavior: Implications for Managing Downstream Flood Risk, AquaUoS, University of Salford, Salford

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<p>increase in winter flow, and any consequent increase in energy, through the main channel, would affect the distribution of suitable lamprey spawning and larval habitat, which depends on the erosion and deposition of suitable substrate. Surveys to record suitable spawning habitat (and/or the occurrence of reeds), and suitable larval habitat (and/or the occurrence of larval lamprey) should be considered within any areas where substrate conditions may be affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220] have been recorded in the wider study area. The Department would like to note that these features are being proposed as potential qualifying interests of the River Moy SAC. Consequently, the Department considers that appropriate surveys to determine the presence of this habitat within the ZOI of the proposed scheme should be undertaken. 	
The Heritage Council	<p>The Heritage Council supports the FRS in principle. The following should be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage Council and partners' "<i>Ballina Collaborative Town Centre Health Check (CTCHC) Report</i>" (2020) and "<i>Town Centre First Policy</i>" (2022) 2. The Heritage Council recommends that this important CTCHC research informs the proposed FRS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – in relation to the public realm adjacent to the River Moy in the historic core. – any [hard] engineering proposals ensure the protection and enhancement of important historic vistas, which have existed for hundreds of years and combine to create the unique 'time depth'. – In relation to the importance of Ballina's built heritage, the Heritage Council would recommend that a registered Conservation Architect is part of the overall project team. 3. Consider Government Climate Policy: Climate Action Plan 2023 and National Adaptation Framework 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Putting off any nature-based catchment management to a later date, is not appropriate. The identified catchment wide measures, including woodland creation, improved land management practices such as re-wetting drained areas, river restoration works, such as riverbank restoration, construction of instream structures should be considered as an integral part of the Proposed Scheme. – The Climate Action Plan 2023 highlights the close link between climate change and biodiversity loss, which is identified in the IPCC 6th Assessment Report and rightly emphasises the need to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystems as a key part of all climate resilient development. 4. Consider Places for People: National Policy on Architecture, published by Department of Housing, May 2022: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed FRS should embrace the recent 'cultural shift' towards quality design-led, people-focused urban areas. This can be demonstrated through envisaging all uses (private and public) and valuing urban morphology, i.e., understanding the town's unique historic form and fabric AND materiality. The project team needs to involve appropriate disciplines including urban design and conservation. – According to MCC, Ballina has one designated Architecture Conservation Area (ACA) Pearse Street, which includes the historic commercial core of the town centre and features several historic laneways that run down to Emmet Street and the River Moy, e.g., Moy Lane. These important historic vistas and pedestrian routes, particularly where they include views across the Moy River to Cathedral Road and Ballina Cathedral beyond, should be considered. 5. Need for a Design Palette and a Public Urban Design Panel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposed materials for the flood relief scheme should be linked to an agreed quality design palette for the historic town centre. Such a design palette, along with a detailed scheme to deliver a vibrant public space in front of Ballina Cathedral, would involve significant input and direction from local and national heritage experts and from key stakeholders including civic and business leaders. 	<p>Chapter 7: Population Chapter 10: Terrestrial Biodiversity Chapter 18: Cultural Heritage Chapter 19: Landscape & Visual</p>

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The FRS, which involves significant public monies and is of huge public interest to Ballina’s citizens and its diaspora, would benefit from the establishment of a Public Urban Design Panel. – Given the lack of these key design components, the proposal requires more consultation and engagement and detail to ensure that any proposal brought forward is for a high-quality addition to the historic built environment, i.e., the receiving environment in Ballina. <p>6. The “<i>Draft National Biodiversity Action Plan</i>” acknowledges the importance of conserving biodiversity in the wider countryside, and not limiting conservation actions to designated areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Outcome 2B of the plan includes conservation actions for the wider countryside, highlighting the importance of areas that may not be legally protected but, which do, nevertheless provide habitat and connectivity for protected species. These include actions on farming, forestry, flood risk and peatlands. – Action 2B14 of this Plan commits that “<i>OPW will work with relevant authorities to ensure that Flood Risk Management planning and associated SEA, EIA and AA, minimises loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services through policies to promote more catchment wide and non-structural flood risk management measures</i>”. The indicator for this action is “<i>Inclusion of catchment-wide and non-structural measures within the options assessed by Flood Risk Management Plans</i>”. – The constraints study for the Ballina Scheme notes: “The following requirements of the IFI should be considered in the design of the proposed scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong emphasis given to natural flood management techniques. • An assessment of the impact of the existing drainage schemes should be carried out to enhance natural flood management.” – The Heritage Council concurs with these recommendations and is concerned that the opportunity to deliver on Action 2B14 of the National Biodiversity Action Plan may not be fully grasped by this proposed scheme. – In addition to the missed opportunity for nature-based catchment management, the Heritage Council is concerned about any proposed culverting of streams that are currently open water, and the likely impacts of this on amenity as well as biodiversity. – There is also considerable biodiversity importance in the tree, scrub and wetland vegetation growth along the River Moy and Brusna – identified in the Ballina Local Biodiversity Action Plan⁷ as ‘reed and large sedge swamps, depositing/lowland rivers, dry meadows and grassy verges and wet grassland habitat types. In addition to their value in themselves, these are important ecological corridors, an importance also emphasised in the plan. – The Heritage Council would recommend these habitats being treated with care in the proposed flood scheme, e.g., the scheme should ensure that valuable wildlife corridors are not removed and include a commitment that where trees must be removed as part of the works, that mature replacements are installed well in advance of commencement of works. 	
Three Ireland	There are no Three Ireland Sites that could be affected, however, there is an ESB mast that also hosts Eir and Vodafone services within the scheme area.	Chapter 16: Materials Assets Waste & Utilities

⁷ <https://www.mayo.ie/en-ie/your-council/services/heritage-conservation/biodiversity-natural%20heritage/ballina-biodiversity-plan>

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations should be had with the relevant Local Authority/National Roads Design Office with regard to locations of existing and future national road schemes in relation to the N26, national primary road, and N59, national secondary road. • TII would be specifically concerned as to potential significant impacts the development would have on the national road network (and junctions with national roads) in the proximity of the proposed development. Particular focus on the N26 and N59 would be required. • The developer should assess visual impacts from existing national roads. • The developer should have regard to any Environmental Impact Assessment Report/Statement and all conditions and/or modifications imposed by An Bord Pleanála, regarding road schemes in the area. The developer should in particular have regard to any potential cumulative impacts. • Regard to TII Publications (formerly DMRB and the Manual of Contract Documents for Road Works). • Regard to TII's Environmental Assessment and Construction Guidelines, including the Guidelines for the Treatment of Air Quality During the Planning and Construction of National Road Schemes (National Roads Authority, 2006). • The EIAR should consider the Environmental Noise Regulations 2006 (SI 140 of 2006) and, in particular, how the development will affect future action plans by the relevant competent authority. The developer may need to consider the incorporation of noise barriers to reduce noise impacts (see Guidelines for the Treatment of Noise and Vibration in National Road Schemes (1st Rev., National Roads Authority, 2004)). • The developer is reminded of the requirements of TII Publications DN-STR-03001- Technical Acceptance of Road Structures on Motorways and Other National Roads for structures. This Standard specifies the procedures to be followed to obtain Technical Acceptance for structures on motorway and other national road schemes and for the submission of as built records. • The Technical Acceptance requirements, if any, for the assessment, alteration, modification, strengthening and repair of all road structures (national roads) shall be agreed with the Bridge Management Section of TII. • A hydraulic analysis should be undertaken to identify the impact of proposed flood alleviation works on the hydraulic capacity of TII Structures, within the scheme study area and the potential for scour at the structures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a) TII Structure ID MO-N26-001.00 - Rahans Bridge – N26, – b) TII Structure ID MO-N59-002.00 – Ballina Lower Bride – N59, and – c) TII Structure ID MO-N59-001.00 – Brusna River Bridge – N59. • Consideration should also be given to any other TII structures impacted by proposed flood relief scheme measures that may occur outside the identified study area. • The potential for scour of the riverbed at bridges may result from increased flows through the bridge. An assessment of scour and other hydraulic actions in accordance with UK BD 97/12 should be undertaken. Scour prevention measures will be required if the assessment illustrates the potential for scour. • Where appropriate, a Traffic and Transport Assessment be carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines, noting traffic volumes attending the site and traffic routes to/from the site, with reference to impacts on the national road network and junctions of lower category roads with national roads. The Authority's Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines (2014) should be referred to. The scheme promoter is also advised to have regard to Section 2.2 of the NRA/TII TTA Guidelines which addresses requirements for sub-threshold TTA. • The designers are asked to consult TII Publications to determine whether a Road Safety Audit is required. 	<p>Chapter 6: Traffic & Transportation</p> <p>Chapter 12: Water</p> <p>Chapter 13: Air Quality</p> <p>Chapter 15: Noise & Vibration</p> <p>Chapter 19: Landscape & Visual</p> <p>Chapter 20: Interactions & Cumulative Effects</p>

APPENDIX 3

Stakeholder	Summary of Responses	Response Addressed in EIAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the interests of maintaining the safety and standard of the national road network, methods/techniques proposed for any works traversing/in proximity to the national road network should be identified. In relation to haul route identification, the applicant/developer should clearly identify haul routes proposed and fully assess the network to be traversed. Separate structure approvals/permits and other licences may be required in connection with the proposed haul route and all structures on the haul route should be checked by the applicant/developer to confirm their capacity to accommodate any abnormal load proposed. 	
Virgin Media	Confirmed that there are existing underground services adjacent to the above location. Virgin Media note that these services contain live fibre, transmitting data traffic of a highly sensitive nature. Any work to be carried out in the vicinity of this ducting will necessitate that a Virgin Media Plant Protection Officer be present during the work.	Chapter 16: Materials Assets Waste & Utilities