



Cork County Development Plan Review

Section 12(4) Chief Executive's Report

Addendum to Volume One

Part Two (c) and (d):

*Chief Executive's Response and
Recommendations*

*Volume Four South Cork & Volume
Five West Cork*



Comhairle Contae Chorcaí
Cork County Council

Cobh MD - Submissions previously omitted from Volume One Part Two (c):

Interested Party	Hanna Szopna
DCDP345001334	DCDP331824355
Submission Summary	<p>Submits that zoning in the Draft Plan is too restrictive and raises the issue of difficulty in acquiring a site to build a home, making particular reference to the Green Belt. States that taxpayers find it difficult both to buy residential sites and to apply for planning permission.</p> <p>States that farmers, significant landowners, are not taxed for holding unused land, while people struggle to find a place to live.</p> <p>States that people are packed in cities and towns and that virus spreads in places of high density.</p>
Principal Issues Raised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural housing policy. 2. Land hoarding and promotion of development on zoned land. 3. Are densities proposed in the plan appropriate?
Chief Executive's Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural Housing is discussed as a key issue in Volume 1, Part 1 of the CE report. 2. The Council has an active land management programme which seeks to promote and facilitate the delivery of zoned lands. Of particular relevance is its maintenance of a vacant sites register and its charging of a levy on vacant sites. 3. The densities proposed in the plan are considered to be appropriate - see discussion of density as a key issue Volume 1, Part 1 of the CE report.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment proposed.
Interested Party	Jim Murphy
DCDP346277416	DCDP346277416
Submission Summary	<p>Supports the idea of an inclusive village core /centre in Glounthaune which will prove attractive for residents to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - live in, - Do business in, - socialize in, - Celebrate in, - Mature together in, and - Be proud of in decades and centuries to come.
Principal Issues Raised	Supports the idea of an inclusive village core /centre in Glounthaune
Chief Executive's Response	It is considered the policies and objectives of volume One of the Draft Plan provide for the development of inclusive, liveable, attractive, vibrant settlements. The specific objectives for Glounthaune align with these policies. The plan identifies three town/village centre areas in Glounthaune in close proximity to each other.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment proposed.

Interested Party	Peg Dunne
DCDP346195660	DCDP346195660
Submission Summary	Appears to object to CT-I-01 zoning.
Principal Issues Raised	CT-I-01 zoning
Chief Executive's Response	See discussion of this key issue in Volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD of CE report regarding CT-I-01.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment proposed.
Interested Party	Sean Flanagan
DCDP346184584	DCDP346184584
Submission Summary	<p>Submitter is generally encouraged by the Draft Plan as it relates to Glounthaune and believes that local government are listening to residents in our pursuit of creating healthy, sustainable and enjoyable communities to live in.</p> <p>Submitter would encourage further development of local community amenities, stating that all property developers should seek to satisfy community features that reflect local lifestyles and that will be in use every day, such as walking and bike trails and pocket parks located closer to their homes.</p> <p>Notes an added large industrial area in Carrigtwohill (CT-I-01), up to the borders of Glounthaune, stating that it looks hugely inappropriate, removes any greenbelt between the two areas, and promotes sprawl.</p>
Principal Issues Raised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports policy for Glounthaune generally. 2. Does not support CT-I-01. 3. Seeks further development of local community amenities.
Chief Executive's Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is noted. 2. See key issue in Volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD of CE report regarding CT-I-01. 3. It is considered that sufficient provision has been made in the draft plan for community facilities/amenities.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment proposed.
Interested Party	Ronan Bonar
DCDP345415988	DCDP345415988
Submission Summary	<p>Submission relates to CT-R-18 & CT-U-10 zonings for which its states the plan envisages development of 77-111 units. It raises a number of concerns regarding this categorised under societal, environmental and economic issues.</p> <p>These include a concern that the homes will be starter homes and that most of the homeowners will not see a value in committing to the community; that the proposal does not strengthen Carrigtwohill's placemaking resilience; that the CT-U-10 (proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge) is perceived as damaging security of existing, aging, Bog Road community and only necessary due to CT-R-18 residential zoning; that development in line with existing density is what locals want, that it would be more sustainable in terms of traffic, amenities and environment, and that it would attract households that would make a long term commitment.</p> <p>Raises issue of habitat loss that would result from development of land. Points to existing car ownership levels and submits that this will not change, submitting</p>

	<p>that urban amenities such as in Cork will never be reachable by sustainable transport if one lives in Carrigtwohill. It finds that CT-R-18 would only make sense in the context of near zero car ownership. Raises concern regarding capacity of road and intersection to accommodate large scale development, and regarding risk to Bog Road historic stone walls.</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding economic viability of proposed development and of impact on value of existing properties. Fears that development would be without amenities. Adds that land and road are subject to regular flooding and that the land sits above a development of caves.</p>
<p>Principal Issues Raised</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the draft plan allow for sufficient diversity of housing types in Carrigtwohill? 2. Is the density proposed for the CT-R-18 site, and the scale of the site, appropriate? 3. Is the CT-U-10 zoning appropriate? 4. Is an increase in sustainable transport use achievable in Carrigtwohill and the CT-R-18? 5. How are features of the built heritage, such as stone walls of Bog Rd. protected? 6. Is the proposed zoning appropriate from a flood risk perspective?
<p>Chief Executive's Response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan seeks to deliver a more compact growth form in line with national guidance. A high design standard will deliver a diversity of high quality housing types and contribute to an enhanced sense of place. CT-R-18 is zoned for Medium A density residential development. A number of sites, close to the rail station, have been zoned for high density residential development due to their potential to deliver sustainable residential neighbourhoods underpinned by a sustainable transport offering. This is in line with the requirements of national guidelines for Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, allows for a more efficient use of land, and better integration of land uses in this Strategic Employment Location. Other locations in the town, in addition to CT-R-18, have been identified for medium density development and some existing development is at lower densities. 2. A proposed greenway (CT-U-03) will extend from the site to the rail station and employment areas beyond. The site is also adjacent to the proposed CT-C-04 multi schools campus. The density proposed is considered appropriate and is in line with the requirements of national guidelines for Sustainable Residential in Urban Areas. A lower density zoning for CT-R-18 would not be considered appropriate to maximise the potential of this location that is within the built footprint of Carrigtwohill, close to the rail station and town centre. See Key Issue, Density, Chapter 3 in Volume 1 of this report. 3. In line with National Policy and Climate change concerns it is crucial that sustainable transport modes are promoted. The CT-U-10 proposed zoning links CT-R-13, CT-R-18 and the education campus at CT-C-04 and is considered to be necessary. 4. As above, the site is under 1km from the rail station and a proposed greenway (CT-U-03) will extend from the site to the rail station and employment areas beyond. Comprehensive objectives of chapter 12 Transport and Mobility promote sustainable transport. 5. Objective HE 16-13 of the Built Heritage Chapter of the Draft Plan is to protect non-structural elements of built heritage such as masonry walls. 6. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out of the plan. Most recent zone A and B flood risk mapping does not identify CT-R-18 or CT-U-10 as being at risk of flooding. This does not account for pluvial

	flood risk and the approach to same is set out in the strategic flood risk assessment of the plan and in flooding policies on Ch 11.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment proposed.
Interested Party	Shane Lynch
DCDP346242774	DCDP346242774
Submission Summary	<p>Submits the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That there is too much high density being applied in the area and that it is not viable in Cork city, not to mind in Carrigtwohill. Gives derelict apartment blocks in Castl lake as an example. - That, in creating a balanced sustainable community, different housing options are essential, and states that this is not going to happen at 50+ per hectare. - That if, high density is not viable, this means that in the middle of a housing crisis nothing happens in the area earmarked for rapid development. - That the infrastructure in the area is lacking for the current residents, excluding the current volume of housing being built by in Carrigtwohill, and the previous application of 270+ houses in Castl lake.
Principal Issues Raised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriateness of densities applied in Carrigtwohill. 2. Availability of infrastructure in Carrigtwohill.
Chief Executive's Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan seeks to deliver a more compact growth form in line with national guidance. A number of sites, close to the rail station, have been zoned for high density residential development due to their potential to deliver sustainable residential neighbourhoods underpinned by a sustainable transport offering. This is in line with the requirements of national guidelines for Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, allows for a more efficient use of land, and better integration of land uses in this Strategic Employment Location. Other locations in the town have been identified for medium density development and some existing development is at lower densities. See discussion on density in Key Issue, Volume One, Part One, CE Report. 2. In terms of infrastructure, it is considered that the plan makes sufficient provision for the delivery of infrastructure, facilities and services to accommodate the existing and target population for the town and to deliver an attractive, liveable town.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment required.

Bandon Kinsale MD - Submission previously omitted from Volume One Part Two (d):

Interested Party	Tim Coakley
DCDP345981119	DCDP342410180
Submission Summary	The submission asks the question 'Why has the village of Ring and the settlement of Ballinglanna been omitted from the 2022 to 2028 Draft Plan'.
Principle Issues Raised	Questions why Ring and Ballinglanna have been omitted from the Settlement network of the Municipal District.
Chief Executive's Response	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft County Development Plan. This review was based on services provision, size of settlement and potential to deliver housing over the next Plan period to 2028 led to the recommendation for the removal of the development boundary of most village nuclei, other locations and some smaller villages. Any future housing proposals in these settlements will be assessed on the basis of the rural housing policy applicable in the area. Full detail of the network review is set out in Background Document No. 4 Settlements and Placemaking available at https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf .
Chief Executive's Recommendation	No Amendment Proposed.