

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHP	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	CONTEXT	1
1.2	NEED FOR THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	1
1.3	NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME	2
1.4	SCOPING	3
1.5	STRUCTURE OF THE EIS	9
1.6	EIS STUDY TEAM	10
1.7	EIS STUDY TEAM PROFILES	10
2.0	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME	17
2.1	DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA	17
2.2	OVERALL DESIGN PHILOSOPHY	18
2.2.1	INTRODUCTION	18
2.2.2	DEFENCE SCHEME STANDARD	18
2.2.3	CLIMATE CHANGE	20
2.2.4	DEFENCE SCHEME IMPLEMENTATION	20
2.3	NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	21
2.4	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME	22
2.4.1	INTRODUCTION	22
2.4.2	AREA 1 – HARBOUR BRIDGE TO BRAY BRIDGE	22
2.4.3	AREA 2 – BRAY BRIDGE	26
2.4.4	AREA 3 – BRAY BRIDGE TO WESTERN END OF PEOPLES PARK	27
2.4.5	AREA 4 – WESTERN END OF PEOPLES PARK TO THE SLANG/REHILLS LAND	30
2.4.6	AREA 5 – LA VALLEE TO NI I BRIDGE	33
2.5	DETAILS OF CONSTRUCTION	34
2.5.1	PHASING	34
2.5.2	PROGRAMME	34
2.5.3	COMPOUNDS AND SITE ACCESS	35
2.5.4	METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION	36

2.5.5	EMERGENCY PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT OF FLOODING DURING CONSTRUCTION	38
2.6	DETAILS OF OPERATIONAL PHASE OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME	39
2.7	OFF SITE AND SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTS	39
2.8	EXPECTED FUTURE CHANGES TO PROJECT	40
3.0	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME	41
3.1	APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS	41
3.1.1	OPTION 1 – DO NOTHING	41
3.1.2	OPTION 2 – CONTAINMENT ONLY	42
3.1.3	OPTION 3 – CONTAINMENT AND RIVER WORKS	42
3.1.4	OPTION 4 – UPSTREAM STORAGE	43
3.1.5	OPTION 5 – PARTIAL STORAGE AND CONTAINMENT	44
3.1.6	OPTION 6 – PARTIAL STORAGE WITH CONTAINMENT AND RIVER WORKS	45
3.1.7	DESCRIPTION OF ENGINEERING MEASURES	46
3.1.8	DISCOUNTED MEASURES	49
3.2	SUMMARY OF OPTIONS	49
3.2.1	SUMMARY OF OPTION 1 – DO NOTHING	50
3.2.2	SUMMARY OF OPTION 2 – CONTAINMENT ONLY	54
3.2.3	SUMMARY OF OPTION 3 – CONTAINMENT AND RIVER WORKS	59
3.2.4	SUMMARY OF OPTION 4 – UPSTREAM STORAGE	64
3.2.5	SUMMARY OF OPTION 5 – PARTIAL STORAGE AND CONTAINMENT	67
3.2.6	SUMMARY OF OPTION 6 – PARTIAL STORAGE WITH CONTAINMENT AND RIVER WORKS	72
3.3	PREFERRED OPTION	77
3.3.1	SELECTION CRITERIA	77
3.3.2	DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS	81
3.3.3	SELECTION OF OPTIONS	109
4.0	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	110
4.1	INTRODUCTION	110

4.2	ADMINISTRATIVE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY AREA	110
4.3	NATIONAL PLANNING CONTEXT	110
4.3.1	MAKING IRELANDS DEVELOPMENT SUSTAINABLE, 2002	110
4.3.2	NATIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY, 2002	110
4.3.3	NATIOANL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2007-2013	111
4.4	REGIONAL PLANNING ISSUES	112
4.4.1	REGIONAL PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR THE GREATER DUBLIN AREA 2004-2016	112
4.5	LOCAL PLANNING CONTEXT	113
4.5.1	WICKLOW COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2004-2010	113
4.5.2	BRAY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2005-2011	114
5.0	ASPECTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT CONSIDERED	118
5.1	HUMAN BEINGS	118
5.1.1	CONTEXT	118
5.1.2	METHODOLOGY	118
5.1.3	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	119
5.1.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	120
5.1.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	125
5.1.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	125
5.1.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	126
5.1.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	127
5.1.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	127
5.1.10	REINSTATEMENT	127
5.1.11	MONITORING	127
5.2	TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY	128
5.2.1	FLORA	128
5.2.1.1	CONTEXT	128
5.2.1.2	METHODOLOGY	128
5.2.1.3	DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	128
5.2.1.3.1	DESIGNATED SITES FOR CONSERVATION	128
5.2.1.3.2	GENERAL ECOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA	129

5.2.1.3.3	DESCRIPTION OF HABITATS, VEGETATION AND FLORA WITHIN STUDY AREA	130
5.2.1.3.4	OVERVIEW OF CONSERVATION VALUE OF HABITATS AND FLORA SPECIES	132
5.2.1.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	132
5.2.1.4.1	CHARACTER AND SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS	132
5.2.1.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	133
5.2.1.5.1	HABITAT AND VEGETATION REINSTATEMENT	133
5.2.1.5.2	TREATMENT OF ALIEN SPECIES	134
5.2.1.5.3	GREATER YELLOW CRESS	134
5.2.1.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	134
5.2.1.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	135
5.2.1.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	135
5.2.1.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	135
5.2.1.10	REINSTATEMENT	135
5.2.1.11	MONITORING	135
5.2.2	FAUNA	136
5.2.2.1	CONTEXT	136
5.2.2.2	METHODOLOGY	136
5.2.2.2.1	MAMMALS, AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES	136
5.2.2.2.2	BIRDS	137
5.2.2.3	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	138
5.2.2.3.1	MAMMALS, AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES	138
5.2.2.3.2	BIRDS	141
5.2.2.3.3	OVERVIEW OF CONSERVATION VALUE OF FAUNA	142
5.2.2.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	142
5.2.2.4.1	OTTERS	143
5.2.2.4.2	BADGERS	143
5.2.2.4.3	BATS	144
5.2.2.4.4	KINGFISHER AND RIPARIAN SPECIES	144
5.2.2.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	145
5.2.2.5.1	OTTERS	145
5.2.2.5.2	BADGERS	146

5.2.2.5.3	BATS	146
5.2.2.5.4	KINGFISHER	147
5.2.2.5.5	OTHER NESTING BIRDS	147
5.2.2.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	148
5.2.2.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	148
5.2.2.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	148
5.2.2.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	149
5.2.2.10	REINSTATEMENT	149
5.2.2.11	MONITORING	149
5.3	AQUATIC ECOLOGY	150
5.3.1	CONTEXT	150
5.3.2	METHODOLOGY	150
5.3.3	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	153
5.3.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	159
5.3.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	162
5.3.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	164
5.3.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	166
5.3.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	167
5.3.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	167
5.3.10	REINSTATEMENT	168
5.3.11	MONITORING	168
5.4	SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND HYDROGEOLOGY	170
5.4.1	CONTEXT	170
5.4.2	METHODOLOGY	170
5.4.3	RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	171
5.4.3.1	EXISTING LAND USE	171
5.4.3.2	SITE HISTORY	172
5.4.3.3	SOILS	173
5.4.3.4	SUBSOILS (QUATERNARY GEOLOGY)	173
5.4.3.5	BEDROCK GEOLOGY	175
5.4.3.6	HYDROGEOLOGY	175
5.4.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSAL	176

5.4.4.1	CONSTRUCTION PHASE	176
5.4.4.2	OPERATIONAL PHASE	179
5.4.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	179
5.4.5.1	CONSTRUCTION PHASE	179
5.4.5.2	OPERATIONAL PHASE	180
5.4.6	RESIDUAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL	180
5.4.6.1	CONSTRUCTION PHASE	180
5.4.6.2	OPERATIONAL PHASE	181
5.4.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	181
5.4.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	181
5.4.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	182
5.4.10	REINSTATEMENT	182
5.4.11	MONITORING	182
5.5	WATER	183
5.5.1	CONTEXT	183
5.5.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	186
5.5.3	METHODOLOGY	191
5.5.4	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORKS	200
5.5.5	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	202
5.5.6	MITIGATION MEASURES	207
5.5.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	208
5.5.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	209
5.5.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	209
5.5.10	REINSTATEMENT	209
5.5.11	MONITORING	209
5.6	AIR AND NOISE	211
5.6.1	AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE	211
5.6.1.1	CONTEXT	211
5.6.1.2	METHODOLOGY	212
5.6.1.2.1	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	212
5.6.1.3	DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	213
5.6.1.4	POTENTIAL AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	214

5.6.1.4.1	GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	215
5.6.1.4.2	MAGNITUDE OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	215
5.6.1.4.3	DURATION, FREQUENCY AND REVERSIBILITY OF IMPACTS	215
5.6.1.4.4	CONSEQUENCE OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	216
5.6.1.4.5	SIGNIFICANCE OF AIR IMPACTS	216
5.6.1.4.6	PROBABILITY OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	216
5.6.1.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	216
5.6.1.6	RESIDUAL IMPACT	216
5.6.1.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	217
5.6.1.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	217
5.6.1.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	217
5.6.1.10	REINSTATEMENT	217
5.6.1.11	MONITORING	217
5.6.1.12	SUMMARY	217
5.6.2	NOISE AND VIBRATION	218
5.6.2.1	CONTEXT	218
5.6.2.2	METHODOLOGY	218
5.6.2.3	DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	219
5.6.2.4	POTENTIAL NOISE IMPACTS	221
5.6.2.4.1	NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	221
5.6.2.4.2	GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT OF NOISE IMPACTS	224
5.6.2.4.3	MAGNITUDE OF NOISE IMPACTS	224
5.6.2.4.4	CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC	227
5.6.2.4.5	VIBRATION IMPACT	227
5.6.2.4.6	DURATION, FREQUENCY AND REVERSIBILITY OF IMPACTS	228
5.6.2.4.7	CONSEQUENCE OF NOISE IMPACTS	228
5.6.2.4.8	SIGNIFICANCE OF NOISE IMPACTS	229
5.6.2.4.9	PROBABILITY OF NOISE IMPACTS	229
5.6.2.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	229
5.6.2.6	RESIDUAL IMPACT	231
5.6.2.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	231

5.6.2.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	231
5.6.2.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	231
5.6.2.10	REINSTATEMENT	231
5.6.2.11	MONITORING	231
5.6.2.12	SUMMARY	231
5.7	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL	233
5.7.1	CONTEXT	233
5.7.2	METHODOLOGY	233
5.7.3	RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	234
5.7.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	240
5.7.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	241
5.7.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	242
5.7.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	251
5.7.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	252
5.7.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	252
5.7.10	REINSTATEMENT	252
5.7.11	MONITORING	252
5.7.12	SUMMARY	253
5.8	MATERIAL ASSETS	254
5.8.1	CONTEXT	254
5.8.2	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION DURING CONSTRUCTION	254
5.8.2.1	CONTEXT	254
5.8.2.2	METHODOLOGY	254
5.8.2.3	DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	254
5.8.2.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	254
5.8.2.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	255
5.8.2.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	256
5.8.2.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	256
5.8.2.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	256
5.8.2.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	256
5.8.2.10	REINSTATEMENT	256

5.8.2.11	MONITORING	256
5.8.3	PROPERTY	257
5.8.3.1	METHODOLOGY	257
5.8.3.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	257
5.8.3.3	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	258
5.8.3.4	MITIGATION MEASURES	263
5.8.3.5	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	263
5.8.3.6	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	263
5.8.3.7	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	264
5.8.3.8	POSITIVE IMPACTS	264
5.8.3.9	REINSTATEMENT	264
5.8.3.10	MONITORING	264
5.8.4	ACCESS AND RIGHTS OF WAY	265
5.8.4.1	METHODOLOGY	265
5.8.4.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	265
5.8.4.3	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	265
5.8.4.4	MITIGATION MEASURES	267
5.8.4.5	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	267
5.8.4.6	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	267
5.8.4.7	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	268
5.8.4.8	POSITIVE IMPACTS	268
5.8.4.9	REINSTATEMENT	268
5.8.4.10	MONITORING	268
5.8.5	TOURISM AND RECREATION	269
5.8.5.1	METHODOLOGY	269
5.8.5.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	269
5.8.5.3	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	269
5.8.5.4	MITIGATION MEASURES	271
5.8.5.5	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	271
5.8.5.6	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	271
5.8.5.7	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	272

5.8.5.8	POSITIVE IMPACTS	272
5.8.5.9	REINSTATEMENT	272
5.8.5.10	MONITORING	272
5.9	CULTURAL HERITAGE	273
5.9.1	CONTEXT	273
5.9.1.1	DEFINITION OF STUDY AREA	273
5.9.2	METHODOLOGY	273
5.9.3	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	274
5.9.3.1	LOCAL HISTORY	274
5.9.3.2	ARCHAEOLOGY	279
5.9.3.3	ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE	281
5.9.4	POTENTIAL IMPACTS	282
5.9.4.1	LOCAL HISTORY	282
5.9.4.2	ARCHAEOLOGY	282
5.9.4.3	ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE	283
5.9.5	MITIGATION MEASURES	284
5.9.5.1	LOCAL HISTORY	284
5.9.5.2	ARCHAEOLOGY	284
5.9.5.3	ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE	285
5.9.6	RESIDUAL IMPACTS	285
5.9.7	THE DO NOTHING SCENARIO	285
5.9.8	THE WORST CASE SCENARIO	286
5.9.9	POSITIVE IMPACTS	286
5.9.10	REINSTATEMENT	286
5.9.11	MONITORING	287
6.0	INTERACTIONS	288
7.0	REFERENCES	296
7.1	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME	296
7.2	TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY	296
7.2.1	FLORA	296

7.2.2	FAUNA	297
7.3	AQUATIC ECOLOGY	297
7.4	FISHERIES	299
7.5	WATER	299
7.6	CULTURAL HERITAGE	300
8.0	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	304
A	PUBLIC CONSULTATION	
B	TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY	
C	AQUATIC ECOLOGY	
D	FISHERIES	
E	SOILS, GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY	
F	NOISE AND VIBRATION	
G	TREE SURVEY	
H	PHOTOMONTAGES	

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Study Area	
2.2	Division of Study Area	
2.3	Study Area 1 – Harbour Bridge to Bray Bridge	
2.4	Study Area 2 – Bray Bridge	
2.5	Study Area 3 – Bray Bridge to western end of People’s Park	
2.6	Study Area 4 – Western end of People’s Park through the Slang/Rehills Lands to La Vallee	
2.7	Study Area 5 – La Vallee to N11 Bridge	
2.8	Seapoint Court and Golf Club Defences	24
2.9	Upstream of Bray Bridge	27
2.10	People’s Park and The Maltings	28
2.11	Coburg Estate Defences	30
2.12	Rehills Land/The Slang widening	31
2.13	Rehills La Vallee widening	34
3.1	Flood Flow Paths in approach to Bray Harbour Railway Bridge	81

3.2	Representative Cross Sections through the modelled reach	83
3.3	Water Surface Profiles for 200m³/s and 100m³/s flows	84
3.4	Predicted Flood Inundation in the ‘Do Nothing’ Scenario	85
3.5	Design Flood Profile for Option 2	86
3.6	Section Through Peoples Park Option 2	87
3.7	Locations of Regrading 1 to Regrading 6	88
3.8	Design Flood Profile for channel with measures RI-R5	89
3.9	Design Flood Profile for channel with measures A4-A6 in conjunction with RI-R5	90
3.10	Design Flood Profile for channel with measures CI-C7 in conjunction with measures RI-R5 and A4-A6	91
3.11	Design Flood Profile highlighting afflux at Bray Bridge	92
3.12	Proposed single span bridge elevation	93
3.13	Design Flood Profiles for channel with individual measures B3 and B5 in conjunction with measures RI-R5, A4-A6 and CI-C7	93
3.14	Design Flood Profiles for channel with individual measures D1-D8 and E2 in conjunction with measures RI-r5, A4-A6, CI-C7 and B3	95
3.15	Regarded bed profile with ‘R4+R5’	96
3.16	Design Flood Profile for channel with ‘R4+R5’ in conjunction with measures RI-R3, A4-A6, CI-C7, B3, D1-D8 and E2	97
3.17	Location of Upstream Storage	98
3.18	Typical Dam detail	98
3.19	Storage Area for Option 4	99
3.20	Design Flood Profiles – Option 2 and 5	100
3.21	Storage Area for Options 5 and 6	101
3.22	Design Flood Profiles – Options 3 and 6	102
3.23	Summary of specific issues raised by Public at Public Consultation Day	104
3.24	Proposed Regrading of People’s Park (Options 3 and 6)	104
3.25	Configuration of existing river approach to Bray Harbour	105
3.26	Option 3 Variation E	106
3.27	Design Flood Profile – Option 3 and Option 3 Variation E	107
3.28	Design Flood Profiles – Option 6 and Option 6 Variation E	108
4.1	Schematic of Boundary between Bray Town Council Lands and Wicklow County Council Lands	

4.2	Undeveloped Areas	
5.1.1	Area 1 – Harbour Bridge to Bray Bridge	
5.1.2	Area 2 – Bray Bridge	
5.1.3	Area 3 – Bray Bridge to the western end of People’s Park	
5.1.4	Area 4 – Western end of People’s Park through the Slang/Rehills Land to La Vallee	
5.1.5	Area 5 – La Vallee to N11 Bridge	
	Flood level recorded in Sheridan’s Lane, Little Bray, following the 1905 flood (taken from ‘A Pictorial History of Bray – The Seafront and its Environs’ (Cairns H & Gallagher E, 2004)	184
5.5.1	Extent of flooding from ‘Hurricane Charlie’, August 1986	185
5.5.2	River Dargle catchment with main tributaries	187
5.5.3	Schematic of a HEC-RAS hydraulic model geometry	192
5.5.4	Locations of flow monitoring instrumentation installed in Lower Dargle	192
5.5.5	Calibration profile for the HEC-RAS model (Profile of 29th October 2004 at 5:45am)	193
5.5.6	Calibration profile for the HEC-RAS model (Profile of 29th October 2004 at 12:00pm)	194
5.5.7	Variation of tide levels with time at Dublin Port and Bray Harbour	198
5.5.8	Potential flood map of Bray for channel in ‘existing’ condition (left) and ‘post-development’ condition with full flood defences	203
5.5.9	Identification of cross-sections through the river reach analysed in study	204
5.5.10		
5.7.1	Area 1 and 2 – Vegetation Map	
5.7.2	Area 3 – Vegetation Map	
5.7.3	Area 4 – Vegetation Map	
5.7.4	Area 5 – Vegetation Map	
5.7.5	Area 1 and 2 – Land Use Map	
5.7.6	Area 3 – Land Use Map	
5.7.7	Area 4 – Land Use Map	
5.7.8	Area 5 – Land Use Map	
5.7.9	Visual Analysis (Area 1 and Area 2)	
5.7.10	Visual Analysis (Area 3)	
5.7.11	Visual Analysis (Area 4)	
5.7.12	Visual Analysis (Area 5)	

- 5.7.13 Tree Protection – Sheet 1 of 4**
- 5.7.14 Tree Protection – Sheet 2 of 4**
- 5.7.15 Tree Protection – Sheet 3 of 4**
- 5.7.16 Tree Protection – Sheet 4 of 4**
- 5.7.17 Tree Protection – Fence Detail Type 1**
- 5.7.18 Tree Protection – Fence Detail Type 2**
- 5.7.19 Proposed Planting Structure**
- 5.9.1 Map of Bray superimposed with original course of River Dargle**
- 5.9.2 Map of Bray showing River Dargle extending into Golf Course Lands**
- 5.9.3 Map of Bray showing total extent of Archaeological Zone (Site CH-1) and locations of Sites CH-1A, CH-1B and CH-1C**
- 5.9.4 Medieval Bray – locations of monuments**
- 5.9.5 Former Bray Bridge in 1842 – from east**
- 5.9.6 Locations of Relevant Sites of Architectural Heritage Interest**

LIST OF PLATES

3.1	Type of flow control structure that could be utilized for flow control through dam	100
5.5.1	Problems with bank slopes stability in the Dargle catchment	209
5.9.1	Buttress foundation of Former Bridge (Site CH-1C)	
5.9.2	Bray Bridge (Site CH-11) – western/upstream façade	
5.9.3	Views of Bray Bridge (Site CH-11) and Ravenswell Road Bridge (Site CH-12) from south-east.	
5.9.4	Ravenswell Road Bridge (Site CH-12) – riverside/southern façade	

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Key Constraints identified under Stage 1	4
1.2	Comments from Public with respect to Flood Defence Options presented at Public Consultation Day	6
1.3	Aspects of the environment to be considered	8
1.4	EIS Study Team	10
3.1	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with measures R1-R5	89
3.2	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with measures A4-A6 in conjunction with R1-R5	90
3.3	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with measures C1-C7 in conjunction with R1-R5 and A1-A6	92
3.4	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with measures B3 and B5 in conjunction with measures R1-R5, A4-A6 and C1-C7	94
3.5	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with measures D1-D8 and E2 in conjunction with measures R1-R5, A4-A6, C1-C7 and B3	95
3.6	Predicted Design Flood Water Levels for channel with ‘R4+R5’ in conjunction with measures R1-R3, A4-A6, C1-C7, B3, D1-D8 and E2	97
3.7	Predicted Flood Water Levels – Options 2 and 5	101
3.8	Predicted Flood Water Levels – Option 3 and 6	102
3.9	Comments from Public with respect to Flood Defence Options presented at Public Consultation Day	103

3.10	Predicted Flood Water Levels – Option 3 and Option 3 Variation E	108
3.11	Predicted Flood Water Levels – Option 6 and Option 6 Variation E	108
3.12	Cost Benefit Ratio	109
5.3.1	Recommended monitoring time table	169
5.4.1	Review of Historical Ordinance Survey (OS) Maps	173
5.4.2	Analytical Results	174
5.5.1	Chemical analysis of water samples collected in Dargle catchment from 2001-2003	189
5.5.2	Pollution rating of water samples collected in Dargle catchment	190
5.5.3	Summary of flows determined using FSR methodologies	195
5.5.4	Components of final design river flow	197
5.5.5	Components of extreme design tide level	197
5.5.6	Existing and post-scheme water depths – river flow of 2m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	205
5.5.7	Existing and post-scheme water depths – river flow of 5m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	205
5.5.8	Existing and post-scheme water depths – river flow of 10m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	205
5.5.9	Existing and post-scheme water depths – river flow of 25m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	205
5.5.10	Existing and post-scheme water depths – river flow of 50m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	205
5.5.11	Existing and post-scheme channel velocities – river flow of 2m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	206
5.5.12	Existing and post-scheme channel velocities – river flow of 5m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	206
5.5.13	Existing and post-scheme channel velocities – river flow of 10m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	206
5.5.14	Existing and post-scheme channel velocities – river flow of 25m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	206
5.5.15	Existing and post-scheme channel velocities – river flow of 50m³/s; tide level of 0 mOD	207
5.6.1.1	Limit values from air quality standards regulations SI 271/02.	212
5.6.1.2	Qualitative description of the magnitude of changes	213
5.6.1.3	Air Quality Impact Significance Criteria	213
5.6.2.1	Summary of results of noise surveys	221
5.6.2.2	Maximum permissible construction noise levels at the façade of dwellings (NRA October 2004)	223
5.6.2.3	Subjective response to change in noise level, and description of	224

	typical noise levels	
5.6.2.4	Calculated noise level at houses for the range of anticipated construction activities.	225
5.6.2.5	Procedure for assessment of overall noise impact, taking account of the duration of construction noise levels	229
5.6.2.6	Significance of Noise Impacts at Nearest Noise Sensitive Locations to the proposed works.	229
6.1	Interactions Matrix	289