



Cork County Development  
Plan Review

**Section 12(4)**  
**Chief Executive's Report**

**Volume One Part Two (c):**  
*Chief Executive's Response and  
Recommendations*  
*Volume Four South Cork*



Comhairle Contae Chorcaí  
Cork County Council



# Table of Contents

<b>Carrigaline Municipal District .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Cobh Municipal District .....</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>East Cork Municipal District .....</b>	<b>271</b>
<b>Macroom Municipal District .....</b>	<b>368</b>

**Volume One Part 2(c) :**

**Chief Executive's**

**Response and Recommendations to Submissions**

**Volume Four South Cork**

Volume Four -South Cork - Carrigaline Municipal District.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Alice Cross</b>
<b>DCDP345866053</b>	DCDP345866053
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission regards zonings RY-I-01, RY-T-01 and RY-O-01. It states the site is generally well serviced, with all the required utilities/ infrastructure in close distance for future connections and states the south of the site borders the existing N28 National Route. The submission refers to the permitted M28 which would benefit the area. It notes what the development of the site will need to primarily take account of.</p> <p>The submission provides a detailed analysis of the sites, stating the level plateaus at the north and at the south of the site adjacent to the existing N28 are most suited for feasible development. It notes a Masterplan framework has been prepared and includes maps and images to illustrate the site.</p> <p>The submission suggests re-shaping/extending of the zoning boundaries to the south and north would help to facilitate the placement of feasible development, that could be delivered during the life of the new development plan, whilst also being cognizant of the visual impact on the surrounding area and adjacent residents.</p> <p>The submission states a number of significant changes have taken place in Ringaskiddy/Shanbally since the current specific development objectives were established and outlines what these are.</p> <p>The submission discusses the proposed general zoning objectives under the following headings: Strategic Planning and Economic Growth, Land Supply and Demand, Land Use and New Areas, Green Energy, Flood Risk, Market Testing, and Feasible Development Layout.</p> <p>The submission requests the land requirement targets and zoning boundaries at RY-I-01 are adjusted to cater for a broader / complimentary mix of uses, to ensure that local and global business can be intrinsically linked and can help Ireland in economic recovery.</p> <p>The submission suggests that new business priorities are emerging as a result of Brexit and the Pandemic such as; logistics, warehousing, distribution and green energy, and lists what these need to be considered in terms of.</p> <p>Regarding RY-GA-01 it suggests reference to the structural landscape setting for the adjoining industrial zoning including the provision and maintenance of tree planted buffers to the southern and northern boundaries of the site would remain. It states that the area of land would be re-scaled /boundaries re-shaped to work with the natural topography and existing tree areas. It suggests reference to golf course and playing pitches should be removed as they are located in RY-GA-02.</p> <p>Regarding RY-T-01 it suggests a minor amendment is made to the wording in the context of allocating a residential target similar to Ringaskiddy and outlines reasons as to why, such as alleviating the housing pressures in Carrigaline. It suggest that the subject site be proposed for an in-fill development.</p> <p>Regarding RY-I-01: it suggests a reference to offices, laboratories, manufacturing and utilities would remain and states it would be</p>



	<p>appropriate to broaden the zoning reference to provide emphasis on the overall importance of adequate capacity of suitably zoned lands for strategic employment, port related and or complimentary uses, such as large-scale employment, port etc. It outlines what an adjustment of the zoning objective area could do.</p> <p>The submission suggests a new zoning objective be introduced for uses compatible with RY-I-01, such as retaining the concept of open space/buffer but also include for green energy related uses as open for consideration. It states sustainability is a key objective of many industrial occupiers.</p> <p>It notes the Ariel view and topography shows the site does not pose a flood risk and requests this reference be removed.</p> <p>It states the proposed amendments would facilitate development in the lifetime of the plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests to change the zoning of lands in RY-GA-01 in order to extend the areas zoned RY-I-01 and RY-T-01 zonings.</li> <li>2. Requests new zoning objective for green energy related uses.</li> <li>3. Suggests that new business priorities are emerging as a result of Brexit and the Pandemic such as; logistics, warehousing, distribution and green energy, and lists what these need to be considered in terms of.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RY-I-01, RY-GA-01 and RY-T-01 have been amended as a result of this submission. Cork County Council recognises the strategic importance of Ringaskiddy and will continue to work with stakeholders to ensure the best approach to the future development of Ringaskiddy. Cork County Council are preparing to do a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county, including Ringaskiddy.</li> <li>2. The Plan has not included any proposal for a specific zoning category for green energy related uses and is awaiting for example national policy in relation to solar farm proposals. Chapter 13 Energy and Telecommunications of the Plan does however include a section on renewable energy and the various forms of renewable energy.</li> <li>3. Noted. The plan accounts for emerging trends as a result of Brexit and the Pandemic. Chapter 1 Introduction, Vision and Context paragraph 1.6.3 and 1.6.4 addresses this issue.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See Amendments No. 4.1.5.8 – 4.1.5.10.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Allen Cotter</b>
<b>DCDP345539226</b>	DCDP345539226
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the

	parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Amy Elizabeth Corkery</b>
<b>DCDP346222915</b>	DCDP346222915
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states it is good news for Carrigaline and the surrounding areas to see the forward thinking of making the Fernhill Expansion Area plan and the Hi-tech campus plan. It notes employment and housing are in great need for all the families in the area, and it will improve this part of Carrigaline.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ann Hayes</b>
<b>DCDP346083265</b>	DCDP346083265
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this

	buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anthony O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345302094</b>	DCDP345302094
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission thanks Cork County Council for maintaining the Green Infrastructure and the Planning Development Boundary in the Crosshaven and Bays area. It notes key decisions like this have allowed for the natural movement of wildlife in the area and allows the wildlife to continue to flourish. It states any further development in this area would greatly impact the village as a tourist area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the inclusion of the Green Infrastructure zonings in the Development Plan in Crosshaven and Bays.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Arthur O Leary</b>
<b>DCDP346287263</b>	DCDP346287263
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submitters state they are residents of the Coast Road and are aware of tentative moves to build on the crest and upper slopes of Kilmichael East to the north of the Coast Road. The submission states this does not fit into Cork County Council policy to protect landscape of high visual appeal and high value.</p> <p>It states the main objection is that the land highlighted as housing policy Rural with a high urban influence puts the Skyline at risk, which must be protected.</p> <p>The submission states the development boundary as outlined in Draft Development plan 2022 should be adhered to as there is adequate space to</p>



	<p>infill and continue to develop on the southern reaches of the Coast road. It states this will provide housing for local people and families moving to the area. It also states this will ensure views towards Ringabella Bay from the Coast Road are protected as all development will be below the road which is the precedent which has been set recently. It states this protects views from Ringabella peninsula to Kilmichael East by avoiding further ribbon development on the crest of the hill and disruption of the skyline. It is noted there are pressures on the Council to develop outside of urban areas, but the submission states this tranche of land across the crest of the hill is enjoyed by the seagoing fraternity, cruise ships and sports enthusiasts from Cork Harbour, Ringabella, Roches Point and Power Head, thus, notes it is imperative that this particular northerly aspect with 360 degree views be protected.</p> <p>The submission states it would support the renovation of amenities and upgrades of the rights of way and a safe access route to the swimming spot at Poll Gorm. It notes viewing points, seating areas and parking would add great value for families/swimmers and take pressure off Myrtleville Beach which is straining from the staycation visitors and swimming hoards. The submission requests a footpath or boardwalk along the Coast road from Myrtleville to afford tourists, cyclists, families and walkers the opportunity to enjoy the magnificent views towards Ringabella Bay.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks the protection of the high value landscape area Kilmichael East from further ribbon development at the crest of the hill.</li> <li>2. States there is adequate space to infill and continue to develop on the southern reaches of the Coast road.</li> <li>3. Requests views towards Ringabella Bay from the Coast Road are protected.</li> <li>4. States it would support the renovation of amenities and upgrades of the rights of way and a safe access route to the swimming spot at Poll Gorm.</li> <li>5. Requests viewing points, seating areas and parking which would add great value for families/swimmers and take pressure off Myrtleville Beach which is straining from the staycation visitors and swimming hoards.</li> <li>6. Requests a footpath or boardwalk along the Coast road from Myrtleville.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan employs strong housing policy and policy regarding landscape and areas of high scenic value. The Kilmichael East area is located within the rural housing policy area-Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence.</li> <li>2. Noted. The development boundary of Crosshaven and Bays depicts where potential development may occur.</li> <li>3. Noted. Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Recreation Objective GI 14-12: General Views and Prospects addresses this issue.</li> <li>4. Noted. Objective GI 14-8 – Rights of Way addresses this issue regarding rights of way. An amendment is proposed Green Infrastructure and Recreation Chapter 18 , in which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps</li> </ol>

	<p>under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate. See amendment 1.18.8.</p> <p>5. Noted. This is an operational issue and is beyond the remit of the plan.</p> <p>6. Noted. This is an operational issue and is beyond the remit of the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1 No amendment required.</p> <p>2 No amendment required.</p> <p>3 No amendment required.</p> <p>4 See amendment 1.18.8</p> <p>5 No amendment required.</p> <p>6 No amendment required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Astra Construction Services Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346056817</b>	DCDP346056817
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards subject lands which consist of two separate land parcels which are divided by the land contained within the Compulsory Purchase Order boundary relating the delivery of the M28. It states the Shannonpark lands are set in the wider context of the permitted M28 to the north.</p> <p>It notes it is envisaged that the new motorway and associated upgrades to the existing N28 will be operational by 2027, within the lifetime of the forthcoming plan. It states the County Development Plan should reflect the evolving development context of Carrigaline and that specific land-use zoning objectives should be adopted at lands which may previously have been undeliverable. It requests that the subject lands, which are not subject to CPO proceedings, be identified for 'Business and General Employment' uses in the future County Plan, stating this is consistent with the Core Strategy of the Draft Plan which seeks to concentrate employment and population growth at Metropolitan Towns such as Carrigaline.</p> <p>It notes the Draft CDP recognises the significant contribution that the settlement makes to the 'South Cork and Lower Harbour Growth Triangle' Economic Sub Cluster, of which Carrigaline is identified as a principal location.</p> <p>It states the subject lands offer locational advantages for the delivery of Business and General Employment such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sites location adjacent to the M28/N28 upgrades will ensure the site is served by high quality road infrastructure.</li> <li>• A significant local work force within walking/cycling distance of the lands.</li> </ul> <p>The lands will be served by future upgrades to pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure including the delivery of the CL-U-13 greenway objective to be delivered as part of the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area Masterplan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lands proximity to the existing 24-hour 220 no. bus route linking Carrigaline with other urban centres.</li> </ul> <p>It states that future business and employment uses would represent the compact and sustainable growth of the towns economy. It requests that the development boundary of Carrigaline be extended to include the lands to north of the M28 and south of the existing N28 which are not subject to CPO proceedings. This submission requests the following zoning objective:</p>

	<p>CL-B-03: Business development suitable for small to medium sized industrial units and office-based industry.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021, and Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP). The submission discusses in detail the planning considerations under the following headings: Revised strategy to reflect M28 CPO line, Need for additional logistics development in Cork, and Need for additional business and employment lands in Carrigaline. It includes maps to illustrate the sites. It states based on an analysis on local demographics, commuting patterns and anticipated growth of the settlement, it is concluded that Carrigaline needs to become a more self-sufficient settlement, where employment opportunities are available locally for its residents.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the subject lands, which are not subject to CPO proceedings, be identified for 'Business and General Employment' uses in the future County Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The subject sites are located outside the development boundary of Carrigaline and there are currently no proposals to extend the development plan to accommodate lands for employment uses.</p> <p>Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Astra Construction Services Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346066589</b>	DCDP346066589
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission regards the implementation of the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area (SUEA) Masterplan. The submission outlines the progress of the phasing of the SUEA and provides details of the development, such as the UEA will deliver approximately 1,000 residential units as originally planned.</p> <p>It states to maintain progress on the delivery of future phases, there is a requirement for the specific objectives of the future County Development Plan (CDP) to reflect developments which have occurred in the intervening period since the 2014 CDP and Local Area Plans were adopted, such as the permitted M28.</p> <p>The submission gives an overview of the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area (UEA) with regards to its evolution and the M28. It continues to give a detailed analysis of the future delivery of the UEA, under the following headings: Revised Zoning Strategy to Reflect the M28 CPO Line, Evolution of Masterplan, Primary School Objectives and Other Matters. Maps and masterplan drawings were included to illustrate the site.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high-level documentation perspective, referencing the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p>

	<p>The key points/ recommendations of this submission are stated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states that significant progress of the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area (UEA) can be made during the lifetime of the forthcoming County Development Plan in completing future phases which will assist Carrigaline in achieving required population and housing growth. It notes all necessary road and infrastructural upgrades in the area have taken place during Phase 1 and there are currently no infrastructural obstacles to the delivery of future phases of the Masterplan.</li> <li>• It notes a flexible and rationalised new approach to the zoning and development objectives is required to maintain the momentum on the UEA and ensure the continued supply of housing.</li> <li>• It states the masterplan has changed from the original based on ESB Network requirements.</li> <li>• It states CL-R-12 and CL-R-13 should be consolidated into a single residential zoning objective and extended to meet the defined extent of the M28 CPO line. It notes the rezoning of the subject lands would result in an additional 1.59 hectares of residentially zoned lands which is stated to be deliverable during the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>• It states the pending delivery of the new educational campus to the west of the UEA, to which the subject sites have good connections to, requires a re-evaluation of objective CL-C-02. It states the site is not suitable to deliver given the topography of the site.</li> <li>• It states any future requirement for a new school to service the north of Carrigaline should be focused to the east of the UEA, within the Fernhill UEA lands.</li> <li>• It notes the continued work on the Specific Flood Risk Assessment provides an opportunity to refine the open space strategy for the UEA. It states the current open space strategy, particularly objective CL-O-09, for the UEA is based on a previous analysis of the area and states the objectives of the forthcoming Plan should reflect the existing evolving context in order to optimize the delivery of future phases.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states that significant progress of the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area (UEA) can be made during the lifetime of the forthcoming County Development Plan in completing future phases which will assist Carrigaline in achieving required population and housing growth. It notes all necessary road and infrastructural upgrades in the area have taken place during Phase 1 and there are currently no infrastructural obstacles to the delivery of future phases of the Masterplan.</li> <li>2. It notes a flexible and rationalised new approach to the zoning and development objectives is required to maintain the momentum on the UEA and ensure the continued supply of housing.</li> <li>3. It states the masterplan has changed from the original based on ESB Network requirements.</li> <li>4. It states CL-R-12 and CL-R-13 should be consolidated into a single residential zoning objective and extended to meet the defined extent of the M28 CPO line. It notes the rezoning of the subject lands would result in an additional 1.59 hectares of residentially</li> </ol>

	<p>zoned lands which is stated to be deliverable during the lifetime of the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. It states the pending delivery of the new educational campus to the west of the UEA, to which the subject sites have good connections to, requires a re-evaluation of objective CL-C-02. It states the site is not suitable to deliver given the topography of the site.</li> <li>6. It states any future requirement for a new school to service the north of Carrigaline should be focused to the east of the UEA, within the Fernhill UEA lands.</li> <li>7. It notes the continued work on the Specific Flood Risk Assessment provides an opportunity to refine the open space strategy for the UEA. It states the current open space strategy, particularly objective CL-O-09, for the UEA is based on a previous analysis of the area and states the objectives of the forthcoming Plan should reflect the existing evolving context in order to optimize the delivery of future phases.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The majority of residential development over the lifetime of the plan will be located at the northern end of the town, with Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area currently under construction with further sites granted or pending planning permission.</li> <li>2. Noted. The plan aims to support development to continue the supply of housing, within the UEA, where appropriate.</li> <li>3. Noted. It is acknowledged that due to the positioning of the ESB network which are no longer to be routed underground that this will need to be reflected in the layout of certain sites. Amendments to the overall layout of Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area are proposed by amending the following zonings CL-C-02, CL-GR-09 and CL-U-01 to reflect the on-site infrastructure.</li> <li>4. Noted however, due to the changing dynamics of the construction of the site and the general adherence to the Master Plan that CL-R-12 and CL-R-13 will as is. The development boundary line will be amended to reach the CPO line of the proposed M28.</li> <li>5. On examination it is considered that the school site should remain largely within the area zoned CL-C-02 but to include a revised location to reflect recent planning permissions within the UEA which indicates a revised location of the site for a school and any topographical matters to be considered as part of any future applications.. CL-C-02 will be amended to reflect the current permission for land outlined for a primary school. Amend the layout of Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area by amending the zonings CL-C-02, CL-GR-09 and CL-U-01 to reflect the on-site infrastructure..</li> <li>6. The Fernhill Urban Expansion Area is subject to the delivery of the M28 and a Framework masterplan. The Dept of Education has supported the provision of a school within CL-C-02 and has also requested the provision of a further site be zoned to accommodate a school in within the town of Carrigaline</li> <li>7. CL-GR-09 will be updated to reflect flood risk on the site and what has currently been developed or permitted on the Shannonpark UEA site.</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1 No Amendment Required</p> <p>2 No Amendment Required</p> <p>3 See amendment 4.1.3.4.</p> <p>4 See amendment 4.1.3.24.</p> <p>5 See amendment 4.1.3.4</p> <p>6 No Amendment Required</p> <p>7 See amendment 4.1.3.4.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Atlantic View Residents Association (AVRA)</b>
<b>DCDP346259692</b>	DCDP346259692
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states the Atlantic View Residents Association (AVRA) have engaged in a professional manner with parties, such as the Local Authority, in relation to the various unauthorised developments. It notes they have progressed all matters in accordance with the Planning Act and associated guidelines and have documented and communicated their concerns. It requests that all outstanding issues in relation to the unauthorised developments be progressed in accordance with The Planning Act, and that the governing planning be upheld.</p> <p>The submission outlines the reasons as to why the Atlantic View Residents Association was established. The submission made requests under the following headings:</p> <p>Concern in relation to lack of balanced representation SPC: It notes there has been discussions over concerns that the Development Plan is being developed without any Public Participation Network (PPN) representative on the Strategic policy committee, which states has been highlighted on numerous occasions.</p> <p>Developer Friendly Culture – endemic within Cork County Council: It states there is a well-documented culture endemic within Cork County Council of facilitating Developers and ignoring public interest, and states documentation can be provided on request. It states there are no Sectoral representatives from Environment and Conservation groups, Community and Voluntary groups, or Social Inclusion groups on the SPC to balance this developer friendly culture. It states this is unacceptable and must be remedied as a matter of extreme urgency.</p> <p>The Importance of our public spaces – appeal for this to be genuinely accepted and implemented: The submission highlights the well documented importance of public open spaces in our communities and submits that this has been very clearly highlighted during the on-going Covid 19 pandemic. It notes that this is highlighted in our National Spatial Strategy and in the draft Cork County Development Plan.</p> <p>It notes this has been documented in three County Development Plans, however, there has only been “lip service” implementation and there are numerous examples of public spaces being developed with the active assistance of senior Council Officials. The submission requests support in ensuring that lands granted public open access green area remain so to be</p>



	<p>enjoyed by all the community. It appeals for support in calling out examples where Developers are assisted in illegal development of public open access areas and references first-hand experiences.</p> <p>It states despite the fact that activities clearly “contravene the objectives HOU 14-1 and HOU 14-2 of the County Development Plan” Council Officials continue to assist and facilitate illegal Development of public open access areas. It states this is unacceptable and must be remedied as a matter of extreme urgency.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern in relation to lack of balanced representation on the SPC</li> <li>2. Developer Friendly Culture</li> <li>3. The Importance of our public spaces</li> <li>4. Requests support in ensuring that land granted open space access remain to be enjoyed by all the community.</li> <li>5. Highlights the issues regarding the illegal development of public open access areas.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. Additional wording has been included in Objective SC 6-2 in Chapter 6, on how the Planning Authority will encourage a more inclusive and engaged planning system so that a diversity of voices can be integrated into the planning process and be encouraged to become more involved in their community.</li> <li>2. Noted. This matter is outside the remit of the Development Plan but the matter may be brought to the attention of the relevant section(s) within the County Council.</li> <li>3. Noted. The Plan includes Chapter 3 Housing and Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Recreation includes a number of policies and objectives relating to public open spaces including Green Infrastructure Objectives for our towns and villages while Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking highlights the importance of placemaking and public realm.</li> <li>4. The plan supports long-established green infrastructure and recognises the benefit these amenities provide for the community and the environment.</li> <li>5. Noted. As mentioned Chapter 14 includes Green Infrastructure and Recreation, Objective GI 14-4 – Recreation and Amenity and Objective GI 14-6 – Public/Private Open Space Provision.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>B &amp; M. Creedon</b>
<b>DCDP346117775</b>	DCDP346117775
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings

	and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ballinora and District Community Association Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP336810448</b>	DCDP336810448
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requested the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the pedestrian link between Waterfall and Ballinora is completed by 2028.</li> <li>• That the footpath at Heatherfield estate is extended to the GAA pitch at Ballymah.</li> <li>• That one centralised sewerage treatment is provided at Waterfall to cater for all housing in the village.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issues raised regarding operational issues in Waterfall.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The issues raised in this submission are operational and are beyond the remit of the development plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Barbara Baranowska</b>
<b>DCDP345903815</b>	DCDP345903815
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the

	ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Barbara Ksiazek</b>
<b>DCDP345917791</b>	DCDP345917791
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bernadette Connolly</b>
<b>DCDP345964911</b>	DCDP345964911
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly

	<p>zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>See amendment 4.1.5.4.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Billy &amp; Olga Nicholson</b></p>
<b>DCDP345077423</b>	<p>DCDP345077423</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards Objectives CS-U-01 and CS-U-02. It states the farmland these walkways dissect are private and there are no rights of way through the property. The submissions objects to the proposed walkways on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states there was no prior consultation until the walkways were seen in the plan.</li> <li>2. It states the farm is a beef and tillage farm heavily stocked with beef animals. It states there could be up to seventy bulls at once, and that cattle graze the fields the proposed walkway goes through. It highlights the danger posed by bulls and suckler cows with young calves to the public who would be using the walkway.</li> <li>3. It notes there is currently an issue with trespassers with people (some anti-social behaviour with young people and drinking) and dogs (people walking dogs both on the leads and off the leads).</li> <li>4. It states there was an existing walkway in the Cruachan woods and Cork County Council allowed a housing estate to be built on part of this area which resulted in displaced biodiversity, trees, and a lovely walkway. It states private landowners should not be made suffer and their farmlands compromised due to Cork County Councils inability to preserve and maintain existing walkways. The submission requests alternative amenity walks.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Issues raised regarding the walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 which dissect farmland.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996 and are indicative lines only. Objective CS-GO-06 of the Plan states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. An amendment is proposed Green Infrastructure and Recreation Chapter 14 , in which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate. See amendment 1.18.8
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Billy Bolster</b>
<b>DCDP346109316</b>	DCDP346109316
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states the new plan for the Carrigaline/Fernhill/Shanbally area is brilliant as it will bring more jobs, houses and roads to the people of Carrigaline. It states the town is so lucky to be able to avail of such well thought out plans, which really cater for everyone in it with new housing, a much needed in the current housing crises and with a very good road network to support it. It states well done to all involved.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Acknowledges the work put into the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. The plan incorporates a sustainable policy framework to provide the best outcome for Cork County.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Billy &amp; Olga Nicholson,</b>
<b>DCDP346493522</b>	DCDP346493522
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Objects to provision of a walkway, subject of objectives CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 in Crosshaven, noting these lands are private and no right of way exists. States there was no prior consultation; the lands are used for beef and tillage and are stocked with bulls; there are already issues with trespassers and people with dogs; and the Council allowed the walkway at Cruachan Woods to be built on so landowners should not have to suffer in order to provide alternative amenity walks.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issues raised regarding the walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 which dissect farmland.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996 and are indicative lines only. Objective CS-GO-06, of the Plan states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. An amendment is proposed Green Infrastructure and Recreation Chapter 14 , in which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate. See amendment 1.18.8

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Blake Walsh</b>
<b>DCDP345289007</b>	DCDP345289007
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands situated in Kilmoney, Carrigaline South along the R611 Kilmoney Road, approximately 2.6km southwest of Carrigaline town centre. It states the landholding is approximately 4.6 hectares in size and is comprised of good quality relatively flat agricultural lands. It notes the landholding is bounded to the north west by a private dwelling, further north lies Cedarwood Drive, the south and east of the lands are primarily agricultural.</p> <p>It states permission was granted by An Bord Pleanála (ABP-306804-20) in 2020 for the for the construction 60 no. residential units on the site, and included provision of a pedestrian footbridge crossing over the stream to the north for the purposes of connecting to a proposed future amenity walk. It states this demonstrated a willingness to bring these lands forward for development in the short to medium term should they be suitably zoned.</p> <p>The submission provides context to Carrigaline, discussing its status as a Metropolitan Town, the significant amount of development which took place over the last few years, and its distinctive identity as a Metropolitan Town which serves as an important residential alternative to Cork City and its Environs. The submission included maps to illustrate the location of the site.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP).</p> <p>It states if Carrigaline is to deliver on its strategic function as a Metropolitan Town, driving growth at a sub-regional level, the strategic planning policy context must support viable housing development during the lifetime of the forthcoming Development Plan. It states it considers that the quantum of residentially zoned lands within the Shannonpark masterplan area may not be adequate to support the housing targets in the short to medium term due to the requirement for significant infrastructure provision. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term. It notes the Draft CDP has identified new lands for employment uses to the north of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02), and there will need to be housing development delivered in tandem to the employment lands to reduce car-based commuting.</p> <p>It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council's</p>



	<p>Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>It states the worsening housing crisis, compounded by the Covid-19 emergency and the construction shutdowns since March 2020, means the delivery of housing in prime locations is imperative. It states the local authority must consider the best and most efficient ways of delivering housing units in the short to medium term.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new residential zoning objective CL-R-15: Medium A Residential Development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests to extend zoning CL-R-15 for residential development in Carrigaline and includes an objective for the site.</li> <li>2. It notes there is a planning permission for 60 units on CL-R-15.</li> <li>3. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term.</li> <li>4. It notes the Draft CDP has identified new lands for employment uses to the north of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02), and there will need to be housing development delivered in tandem to the employment lands to reduce car-based commuting.</li> <li>5. It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council's Climate Action Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. It is noted that there is a permission for 60 units on CL-R-15.</li> <li>3. Chapter 2, Core Strategy addresses the land supply needed to deliver housing units to meet future projected growth. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>4. The Fernhill Urban Expansion Area (UEA) is subject to the delivery of the M28 and is subject to a masterplan. A residential reserve is also located within the Fernhill UEA which would be developed in tandem with the employment lands.</li> <li>5. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>BMOR Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346049697</b>	DCDP346049697
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands at the southern extent of Ringaskiddy village Core and just to the north of the chosen route of the M28. It notes that the policy objectives for Ringaskiddy in the Draft Plan are largely unchanged with limited scope for any growth in population or housing. It states this is despite the continuing ambitious growth targets for Cork that will need to be met in the coming years and the obvious advantages that Ringaskiddy possesses that would allow the settlement to provide for some of that much needed growth.</p> <p>It states the lands are within walking distance of the village core and its associated services, including public transport links, and are adjacent to the community uses zoning in the Draft Plan. The submission outlines a summary of the settlement, stating Ringaskiddy is the location of a ferry terminal where regular services operate between Roscoff and Cork.</p> <p>It outlines Ringaskiddy's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), County Development Plan 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021. The submission includes maps and images to illustrate.</p> <p>The submission discusses in detail the key planning considerations under the following headings: Suitability of the Subject Lands for Development, and Protection of Residential Amenity.</p> <p>The submission requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states the M28 project has been confirmed and the CPO process has commenced, which removes any uncertainty regarding the suitability of the lands for development.</li> <li>• It states the proposed RY-GC-06 zoning objective does not reflect the existing site characteristics or adjoining uses and there is no requirement for a buffer from industrial uses at this specific location.</li> <li>• It notes the subject lands to the south of the existing village are suitable for residential development, and can be easily serviced during the lifetime of the upcoming plan and states the RY-T-02 zoning objective should be extended south to include them.</li> <li>• It states these lands represent a logical extension of the residential development consisting of 34 dwellings granted under planning Ref:19/4640 and 19/6785.</li> </ul> <p>An Appendix was included showing the site location maps.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>The Key Issues raised in this submission are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states the M28 project has been confirmed and the CPO process has commenced, which removes any uncertainty regarding the suitability of the lands for development.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It states the proposed RY-GC-06 zoning objective does not reflect the existing site characteristics or adjoining uses and there is no requirement for a buffer from industrial uses at this specific location.</li> <li>3. It notes the subject lands to the south of the existing village are suitable for residential development, and can be easily serviced during the lifetime of the upcoming plan and states the RY-T-02 zoning objective should be extended south to include them.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The M28 has been confirmed. The Draft Plan includes an indicative line of the M28 route.</li> <li>2. The Town Centre of Ringaskiddy has been extended as part of the Draft Plan which now includes RY--T-03 and RY-T-04 and in view of the limited extent of green infrastructure within this part of the settlement it is considered that RY-GC-06 zoning should remain unchanged to that of the Draft Plan and will compliment the provision of the pedestrian link RY-U-03 which connects RY-C-01 to RY-T-02.</li> <li>3. As mentioned above the Town Centre zoning has already been extended and in view of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, and having regard to Ringaskiddy's role as a Strategic Employment Location additional lands for residential use are not required at this location.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bob Costigan</b>
<b>DCDP345660465</b>	DCDP345660465
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission supports the retention and enhancement of traditional walkways countrywide and particularly those already recognised/identified on old maps of Crosshaven and its environs and in previous development plans. It states the environmental, health and safety benefits of such public walkways are substantial and tie in with national policies regarding such issues. It discusses the established walkways around Crosshaven and states they have enormous potential to divert pedestrians/cyclists, including children, away from busy, dangerously narrow and unsighted roads e.g. the road from 'Goats Cross' to the turn off for Myrtleville. It notes, if they were given due recognition and enhancement, such walkways would be used by many people.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission raised issues with walkways in Crosshaven and Bays and their importance.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long-established and indicative walkways which would provide a benefit to the community and act as a public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Breda Good</b>
<b>DCDP345902137</b>	DCDP345902137
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a

	<p>result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>See amendment 4.1.5.4.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Brendan Mullins, Margaret Mullins (&amp; extended Mullins Family), Martin Rouse</b></p>
<b>DCDP345174181</b>	<p>DCDP345174181</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards zonings CS-GC-08 and CS-GC-09 in the settlement of Crosshaven and Bays. The submission outlined the following requests and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It requests to delete designations CS-GC-08 and CS-GC-09 and replace them with New Residential Infill designation. It states the proposed sites have capability to accommodate sensitive housing for which there is recent precedent.</li> <li>• It notes the current proposal is inconsistent with Objective ZU 18-3 to locate development within settlement boundaries.</li> <li>• It states failure to provide for housing will result in development pressure outside settlement boundary.</li> <li>• It states the open space designations cannot be meaningfully delivered, as the locality is open in nature including beaches, Fountainstown Swamp and agricultural hinterland. It states the areas are inaccessible.</li> <li>• It states views from Coast Road are already blocked or restricted and the open space designation will not improve this situation.</li> <li>• It states objectives for seaward views and landscape conservation can be provided through New Residential Infill, with sensitively sited development, consistent with its surroundings.</li> </ul> <p>The submission gives a history of the ownership of the site, details the surrounding area and location, and gives a detailed site context. The subject sites entail two parcels of land (Site A and Site B) located within the Crosshaven and the Bays area. It states Crosshaven is the principal service</p>

	<p>centre and is surrounded by the traditional coastal settlements in the bays of Fountainstown, Myrtleville and more.</p> <p>The submission includes images and maps of the site to illustrate and provide a site context. The submission gives further detail on Site A (1.2ha) and Site B (0.43ha). It states in both sites there are no public amenity aspects. It notes the two sites are not located within the rural hinterland but inside the development boundary for the settlement node of Fountainstown, therefore, they could be available for sensitive and appropriate development subject to appropriate designation.</p> <p>The submission provided a planning policy context, outlining objectives and policies from the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>Its requests a meeting with the planning authority to discuss how local improvements can be incorporated into the new housing for the area, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths;</li> <li>• Vehicle Passing Bays;</li> <li>• Viewing Points with Parking Provision for Persons of Reduced Mobility.</li> </ul> <p>It notes the subject sites will not be visible from Fountainstown beach however, any such development would be consistent with the organic, coastal nature of the existing local communities.</p> <p>The submission requests the following wording for objectives:</p> <p>CS-GO-01: Within the development boundary of Crosshaven and Bays encourage the development of up to 103 additional dwelling units during the plan period.</p> <p>CS-GO-08: The level of development permitted within the Bays will include appropriate individual residential development only. New dwelling house design and scale needs to be respectful of the character and pattern of existing dwellings while fitting appropriately into the elevated setting of this coastal area of high value landscape overlooking Cork Harbour.</p> <p>It states in the case of the two sites designated for New Infill Development at Fountainstown, a maximum of eight dwellings may be permitted over both sites. It notes a single access point and road layout to each site will ensure orderly development and that visual amenity can be maintained and enhanced. It states both sites can accommodate sensitive development while also opening up vistas for the public in a safe and sustainable way.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests zonings CS-GC-08 and CS-GC-09 be zoned for residential use.</li> <li>2. Requests new wording to objectives CS-GO-01 and CS-GO-08.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. The Green Infrastructure zonings listed serve a purpose for the settlement to protect the coastal landscape.</li> <li>2. The current objectives CS-GO-01 and CS-GO-08 already account for the changes requested. The proposal for the designation of the sites for new infill development is not considered appropriate as a result of the current green infrastructure zonings and would not be</li> </ol>

	considered proper planning and sustainable development. CS-GO-01 and CS-GO-08 require no changes resulting from this submission.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1 No amendment required 2 No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brendan O'Keeffe</b>
<b>DCDP345294462</b>	DCDP345294462
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian &amp; Tracey Geary</b>
<b>DCDP328524536</b>	DCDP328524536
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requested the following: ( 1 ) To conserve and enhance the special character of the Monkstown " Architectural Conservation Area " removal of the waste disposal site in the pier carpark ( 2 ) Extend the street lighting on the Strand Road to Murph's Pub. This will improve road safety and provide a further walking amenity during hours of darkness (3 ) Extend the footpath to Rafeen along the old railway track . This will connect the villages of Monkstown and Rafeen to provide a further walking amenity.



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To conserve and enhance the special character of the Monkstown " Architectural Conservation Area " removal of the waste disposal site in the pier carpark</li> <li>2. Extend the street lighting on the Strand Road to Murph's Pub. This will improve road safety and provide a further walking amenity during hours of darkness</li> <li>3. Extend the footpath to Rafeen along the old railway track. This will connect the villages of Monkstown and Rafeen to provide a further walking amenity.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These issues raised are operational issues and are beyond the remit of the development plan.</li> <li>2. These issues raised are operational issues and are beyond the remit of the development plan.</li> <li>3. These issues raised are operational issues and are beyond the remit of the development plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brigette O Flaherty</b>
<b>DCDP345728523</b>	DCDP345728523
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests to retain this beautiful asset that is teeming with wildlife.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests to retain a beautiful asset that is rich in wildlife.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Caroline Woods</b>
<b>DCDP345705256</b>	DCDP345705256
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is regarding the area Novartis Amenity Park, Ringaskiddy, Cork. It states this is an area which is full of wildlife, ranging from badgers, foxes, rabbits, butterflies, wild birds, including two hawks. It notes the vast eco systems in the wild meadows are amazing along with a large area of native trees. It notes it is a place that is used by regular walkers. It states this area is unique in its wildlife and should be preserved. The submission requests an environmental impact study to be completed to confirm how important this area of natural resources is in an area of high industrial impact.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as

	Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carrigaline Tennis Club</b>
<b>DCDP346084325</b>	DCDP346084325
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission outlines the history of the Tennis Club and states that have membership of over 500. It states membership has increased by over 50% in the last 5 years, resulting in a pressing need to increase the number of courts. It states membership is made up of players aged 5 to 75, and also caters for Community School adult education classes, inter-school competitions and Munster squad coaching.</p> <p>It states in order to enable the club to cater for current membership and the growing population in Carrigaline, they require land to provide additional courts and ancillary facilities. It states the club are looking for land to add 2-3 new courts and ancillary facilities.</p> <p>The submission outlines a planning policy context, referring to the draft Cork County Development Plan, such as referring to paragraph 1.3.30.</p> <p>It states it is clear that extra sports and recreational facilities are needed to cater for the rapid expansion of population in Carrigaline. It states Carrigaline Tennis Club has considered a range of possible expansion options and continues to outline them. It notes the most practical option would be to expand on the land adjoining the existing club.</p> <p>It highlights that a key option to consider is the adjoining County Council owned land off Ferney Road, zoned CL-R-06, which is intended for housing. It states it is clear that sport and recreational facilities will be needed to serve the large expansion in population in this part of Carrigaline, and expansion of tennis facilities is one of the solutions to meeting that need.</p> <p>It notes the plans for social/affordable housing on the land immediately adjoining the tennis club, but insists this would also be ideal for expansion of the tennis club. It also outlines another area of land in Council ownership, south of this housing site, which is stated to be suited for amenity/green infrastructure purposes. It states this land runs along a small stream and is partially wooded and unsuitable for housing development, and could incorporate amenity walks, such as CL-U-08, and could accommodate recreational and sport uses, while maintaining its woodland setting. It contrasts this site to CL-GR-03.</p> <p>The submission requests Cork County Council zone the lands shown in the maps included in the submission, as green infrastructure to provide for the use of these lands for amenity purposes, including walkways and sport and recreation use, (such as tennis courts), within a woodland setting.</p> <p>It states the existing Tennis Club and the land leased to the GAA to the</p>

	<p>north is still shown as zoned for housing and suggests that this should be updated to 'Green Infrastructure' to reflect the current use.</p> <p>The submission includes an Appendix which summarises some of the club's achievements and activities. It states it will take time to achieve all of the objectives but states a major step forward would be to acquire land capable of accommodating at least 2 extra courts. It states this would enable expansion of facilities and membership and would cater for a wider range of club events and coaching programmes to serve the growing town, Carrigaline.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests additional lands for expansion of their sporting facilities.</li> <li>2. It notes extra sports and recreational facilities are needed to cater for the rapid expansion of population in Carrigaline. It states Carrigaline Tennis Club has considered a range of possible expansion options and continues to outline them.</li> <li>3. It notes a key option to consider is the adjoining County Council owned land off Ferney Road, zoned CL-R-06, which is intended for housing.</li> <li>4. It notes the existing Tennis Club and the land leased to the GAA to the north is still shown as zoned for housing and suggests that this should be updated to 'Green Infrastructure' to reflect the current use.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are a number of sites within the settlement zoned for Green Infrastructure -recreational use including CL-GR-03 provides provision for community and sporting facilities and has the potential to accommodate the expansion of the Tennis Club.</li> <li>2. Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Recreation and Chapter 6 address the need for community facilities to grow in tandem with population growth.</li> <li>3. Two additional Part 8 developments are proposed for this site. This site will prioritise the development of residential units in an effort to meet Core Strategy targets outlined in Chapter 2 of the plan.</li> <li>4. Noted. This site will prioritise the development of residential units in an effort to meet Core Strategy targets outlined in Chapter 2 of the plan, therefore it is considered that the residential zoning should remain.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 No amendment required.</li> <li>2 No amendment required.</li> <li>3 No amendment required.</li> <li>4 No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carrigaline United AFC</b>
<b>DCDP345902421</b>	DCDP345902421

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission outlines Carrigaline United AFC's need for additional playing facilities and acknowledges an interest in acquiring new pitches as part of the development of the Carrigaline Inner Western Relief Road.</p> <p>It states as Carrigaline has grown the soccer club has offered football for ever increasing numbers of children and adults. It states their motto is 'Football For All' and they endeavour to provide a positive sporting experience for everyone in the community who wishes to participate. It notes they currently have a total playing membership of 1,200 players and a further 300 voluntary coaches and administrators.</p> <p>It states it has come under persistent pressure to improve and expand their facilities and have invested heavily in the past 20 years to maximise the playing capacity of the Ballea Park site. It states there is no room to expand this site further and the total capacity is inadequate, and the shortfall in capacity is only going to become more pronounced in coming years.</p> <p>It notes over the past decade the club have leased facilities belonging to Hibernians AFC in Shanbally, which is currently subject to a Cork County Council compulsory purchase process related to the development of the M28 and will soon not be an option, leaving the club with a shortage in capacity for training and games.</p> <p>The submission states considering the pressing need to acquire new facilities to continue to meet the sporting demands of the growing community, and given the proximity to the Inner Western Relief Road, the club seek to explore the possibility of installing football facilities as part of this new development.</p> <p>It states the club has spent many years dealing with anti-social behaviour/vandalism on the western perimeter of Ballea Park adjoining the dormant relief road development and it would be gratifying if they were to be succeeded by the installation of a new sporting facility and a site of anti-social behaviour replaced by an arena of sporting fulfilment and accomplishment.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests additional lands for expansion of their sporting facilities.</li> <li>2. It notes considering the pressing need to acquire new facilities to continue to meet the sporting demands of the growing community, and given the proximity to the Inner Western Relief Road, the club seek to explore the possibility of installing football facilities as part of this new development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Zoning CL-GR-02 provides provision for playing pitches and has the potential to accommodate the expansion of the Soccer Club.</li> <li>2. Noted. The Inner Western Relief Road is set to be delivered in 2022.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Castleventry Ltd &amp; Pat O'Farrell</b>

DCDP346215766	DCDP346215766
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards a site which straddles the joint areas of the Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy plan areas and the route of the M28. The submission notes changes to the maps included in the appendix, such as the permission 17/6351 at Raheens for a Photo Voltaic solar energy development, the finalization of the route of the M28 and the completion of the major Irish Water sewage treatment works. The submission requests to zone lands which have been made an isolated pocket of un-zoned land between the existing Carrigaline Built-Up Area and zoned lands in Ringaskiddy and Carrigaline.</p> <p>It notes some of the land is located within the Ringaskiddy Industrial and Open Space zones, within Business and General Employment (CL-B-02) in Carrigaline and states the rest of the subject lands create an isolated island between both settlements. The submission lists the following observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states these lands were proposed as a strategic reserve in the LAP 2017, which was later removed to preserve the greenbelt and an EU site.</li> <li>2. It states these two settlements now have development zones which abut each other, and states the draft plan implies that the eastern boundary consists of the Owenabue estuary, which it states is actually industrial land, an isolated island of land and ESB land.</li> <li>3. It states for numerous years a buffer between both settlements consisted of public utility lands of the ESB, open space zoned lands and the Irish Water treatment works site, and now solar farmlands at Raheen.</li> <li>4. It states is has been examining the use of the eastern part of the subject lands as suitable for the consolidation of solar power generation and storage facilities. It notes negotiations are ongoing with two major energy providers and with a European battery storage institution.</li> <li>5. It notes this proposed land use would further extend the “Utility” buffer between the Carrigaline residential lands and the Ringaskiddy Industrial uses.</li> <li>6. It states the decision of An Bord Pleanala regarding the route and land acquisition for the M28 has a requirement that the proposed Link Road L6472 shall not be built as shown on the TII plans and a revised solution is required.</li> <li>7. It states these lands can play a significant role in achieving the objectives of the planning authority. It states the subject lands can provide a new access as required by Bord Pleanala between Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy via part of the proposed L6472, which would provide the required pedestrian/cycle links which the draft plan requires and would allow the existing substandard Coolmore route next to the estuary to be used primarily as an amenity corridor along the area designated scenic landscape.</li> <li>8. It notes it would reduce the need for major upgrades to the Rock Road and the boreen which bound the lands of CL-RR-01, CL-HT- 01 and CL-B-02.</li> <li>9. It states the lands will facilitate the ESB, after discussions, in relation to the requirements to gain access for heavy vehicles to their compound from any new road to the east, which will obviate the existing difficulties in relation to the Bothar Siochain.</li> <li>10. It notes discussions were had with the council’s property/land department regarding this available route and the solution to the problem</li> </ol>

	<p>to which the Bord's decision gives rise.</p> <p>A proposed land use zoning for the lands to the east of Carrigaline were included in the appendix in the submission, and requests the council review this in view of the fact that: (A) The suggested residential lands are fully serviceable and could be developed as Tier 1 lands, (B) The governing conditions of the Core strategy, (C) The Requirements arising from the decision of An Bord Pleanala in relation to the M28.</p> <p>The submission requests these lands be used as RR and Energy Production, Utility, Storage and related uses regarding future development. It states it should be subject to the road, pedestrian/cycle and open space amenity provision as set out in the Master Plan included in the appendix.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests to zone lands which have been made an isolated pocket of un-zoned land between the existing Carrigaline Built-Up Area and zoned lands in Ringaskiddy and Carrigaline. The submission requests these lands be used as RR and Energy Production, Utility, Storage and related uses regarding future development. It states it should be subject to the road, pedestrian/cycle and open space amenity provision as set out in the Master Plan included in the appendix.</li> <li>2. A proposed land use zoning for the lands to the east of Carrigaline were included in the appendix in the submission, and requests the council review this in view of the fact that: (A) The suggested residential lands are fully serviceable and could be developed as Tier 1 lands, (B) The governing conditions of the Core strategy, (C) The Requirements arising from the decision of An Bord Pleanala in relation to the M28.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site proposed is outside the development boundary of Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy. The plan has already identified lands for business and industrial uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the Strategic Employment Location. Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4. .</li> <li>2. Noted. As above. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Chloe O'Toole</b>
<b>DCDP346033114</b>	DCDP346033114
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this

	buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Chris &amp; Miriam McMahon</b>
<b>DCDP345537934</b>	DCDP345537934
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission contained two letters and requested that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It referenced the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It stated that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It noted there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Chris Morris</b>
<b>DCDP342746636</b>	DCDP342746636



<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Clair McSweeney</b>
<b>DCDP346135528</b>	DCDP346135528
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Claire Garrett</b>
<b>DCDP345535196</b>	DCDP345535196

<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Clive Gash</b>
<b>DCDP345838257</b>	DCDP345838257
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission is a duplicate of DCDP345551978. Objects to provision of a walkway, subject of objective CS-U-02 in Crosshaven, noting these lands are a working dairy farm and the walkway would bisect the lands and run through the farmyard. States there has already been experience of anti-social behaviour and dumping of rubbish near the entrance to the property and questions how a plan was prepared which shows no appreciation of the nature of the farming enterprise here and the potential danger to any member of the public using a walkway along this route. A Folio map and engineering report echoing the difficulties and health and safety concerns with a walkway bisecting a working dairy farm is also submitted.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issue raised regarding the CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 walkways which dissect farmlands in Crosshaven and Bays.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996 and are indicative lines only. Objective CS-GO-06 of the Plan states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. An amendment is proposed Green Infrastructure and Recreation Chapter 14, in which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines

	are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate. See amendment 1.18.8
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr Alan O'Connor</b>
<b>DCDP346171216</b>	DCDP346171216
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission thanks everyone involved in putting the plan together and states great experiences were had when interacting with the planning team. The submissions regards existing built up area, directly east of RY-I-05.</p> <p>The submissions states in the south-west corner of the area, adjacent to or within the Novartis facility, is woodland and a green amenity area which is shown in Figure 4.1.7. It states in an ever-more developed and industrialised area, it represents an important and valued natural amenity which should be safeguarded.</p> <p>The submission suggests wording could be applied with reference to this area, as a specific planning objective or elsewhere in the text, which would acknowledge and give protection to this natural amenity area. It suggests zoning the site as Green Infrastructure.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr Marcia D'Alton</b>
<b>DCDP345987336</b>	DCDP345987336
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that 47 acres of parkland to the west of Novartis manufacturing site in Ringaskiddy be designated as Green Infrastructure. Notes that this developed parkland is not an infrastructure asset and its maintenance is an intrinsic part of the overall planning permission for the Novartis complex under Ref. S/2989/89. Details of the Visual, Conservation and Working Environment objectives of the landscape strategy presented at the oral hearing for the industrial complex are provided. The retention of the 47 acres free from development and the landscaping of this buffer zone are stated as conditions of the planning permission that was granted.</p> <p>The parkland is an asset to Shanbally, where there is a deficit of passive open space within walking distance of residents and these lands are critical for this purpose – a diagram illustrating proposed green infrastructure accompanies the submission.</p> <p>Biodiversity surveys undertaken by Novartis since 2005 have catalogued</p>

	breeding birds within the site, including birds of conservation concern. The buffer zone functions as green infrastructure in accordance with the definition of the European Commission and deserves to be zoned as green infrastructure.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Seamus McGrath</b>
<b>DCDP346497048</b>	DCDP346497048
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That land in Shanbally adjacent to the Novartis plant on the western side be zoned Green Infrastructure. It states the land in question has been used as a recreational area by the local community for decades. It notes it is currently coloured in pink which is a zoning for Existing Mixed/ General Business/Industrial Uses, and states this is not an appropriate zoning given its proximity to a residential area and also its established use as a passive recreational area.</li> <li>• It requests the wording on PW-X-03 be enhanced with respect to the reference to waterfront amenities. It states land immediately adjacent to the water should be solely for public amenities, and the wording needs to be more specific in terms of the scope of the public amenities. The submission asks the Policy Unit to consider how this can be strengthened.</li> <li>• It states CS-T-02 seems to denote the core of the Village, although it doesn't appear to cover the area of the public carpark etc. The submission questions if CS-T-02 is the appropriate Objective. It states it would like some general reference to the possibility of reclamation of foreshore in the core of Crosshaven to facilitate future plans as well as the creation of additional public realm space. It notes any possible reclamation would be subject to a planning process and assessment under environmental and ecological policy.</li> <li>• The submission requests the following line to be added to Marino Point, chapter 8, 8.7.17 - Any development on this site must have regard to the close proximity of the existing large residential area of Passage West as well as future regeneration and development potential of the Town.</li> <li>• It notes the County Development Plan must aim to fully support new businesses as well as business expansion proposals and employment creation. It states while Town and Village centre revitalisation is critical, many businesses, such as light manufacturing, food processing, transportation hubs and others require large sites and by necessity often need to be located outside development boundaries. It requests a general provision be made in the County Development Plan to acknowledge the</li> </ul>

	need to accommodate such proposals on a case by case basis.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</li> <li>2. Requests the wording on PW-X-03 be enhanced with respect to the reference to waterfront amenities.</li> <li>3. The submission questions if CS-T-02 is the appropriate Objective.</li> <li>4. Requests the reclamation of the foreshore, subject to the planning process and assessment.</li> <li>5. Suggests changes to Chapter 8.</li> <li>6. Requests a general provision be made in the County Development Plan to acknowledge the need to accommodate such proposals for new business expansion and employment creation on a case by case basis.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. It is proposed to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</li> <li>2. Noted. PW-X-03 is a unique waterfront site and will be reflected within the text to utilise and enhance the waterfront amenities. Amend wording of objective PW-X-03 to greater reflect its waterfront amenities.</li> <li>3. CS-T-02 denotes the existing built footprint of the village centre in terms of services and facilities and is considered the appropriate zoning for this site with an emphasis on the centre core of the village. The car park is located with the existing residential/mixed residential and other uses but in a more sensitive location close to the foreshore.</li> <li>4. Due to the village's coastal location on the River Owenabue Estuary and proximity to the Cork Harbour SPA and accompanying environmental and biodiversity sensitivities it is not proposed to include any reference to the possibility of reclamation of foreshore in the core of Crosshaven to facilitate future plans as well as the creation of additional public realm space.</li> <li>5. Noted. See Amendment No. 1.8.9.</li> <li>6. Noted. The plan seeks to accommodate and encourage new businesses and expansions of businesses in appropriate locations within the County. Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See amendment 4.1.5.4.</li> <li>2. See amendment 4.1.4.5.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> <li>5. See Amendment No. 1.8.9</li> <li>6. See Amendment No. 1.8.4.</li> </ol>

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Colm O'Toole</b>
<b>DCDP346071659</b>	DCDP346071659
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Conrad Martin and other residents</b>
<b>DCDP346148101</b>	DCDP346148101
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission contains numerous letters all regarding a site at Novartis in Ringaskiddy. The submissions requested that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. They referenced the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. They stated that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. They noted there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Crosshaven Community Association</b>
<b>DCDP346085615</b>	DCDP346085615
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission supports the section dealing with Crosshaven and Bays and states it approves that the objectives of maintaining the character of the area are promoted and the acknowledgement that general infrastructure is inadequate and needs improvement.</p> <p>It supports the inclusion of well used walkways for which provided a great source of relief for many people during the last eighteen months. It highlights that walks like these, some which are not identified on the map, have become more important than ever and approves that Cork County Council is taking seriously its responsibility to protect the right of the public to use public rights of way. It notes that there can be compromises and rerouting of walks where they impinge on facilities e.g. part of route CS-U-01.</p> <p>It notes it agrees with paragraph 1.6.24 and emphasises it is not just vehicular traffic but also cyclist and pedestrian traffic which is why the community association have spent so much time and resources trying to find a solution. It notes it needs to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users in the village centre and make the foreshore more of a feature so people can relax and enjoy the sea aspect without worrying about traffic.</p> <p>It notes the lack of car parking for businesses in the western side of the village continues to be a problem and needs addressing.</p> <p>It supports the objectives of protecting the marine related industry of repair and storage of Crosshaven Boatyard in paragraph 1.6.39 and notes the upgrading and development of the boatyard will be a major boost for Crosshaven.</p> <p>It notes it welcomes the support the plan shows for Camden Fort Meagher, as it fits very well with the overall vision for Crosshaven.</p> <p>It notes Objective CS-GO-07 relating to infrastructure for Graball is really at emergency status with houses being flooded during winter and should be a priority.</p>



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports that the objectives of maintaining the character of the area are promoted and the acknowledgement that general infrastructure is inadequate and needs improvement.</li> <li>2. It supports the inclusion of well used walkways for which provided a great source of relief for many people during the last eighteen months. It notes that there can be compromises and rerouting of walks where they impinge on facilities e.g. part of route CS-U-01.</li> <li>3. Supports paragraph 1.6.24 and emphasises it is not just vehicular traffic but also cyclist and pedestrian traffic. It notes it needs to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users in the village centre and make the foreshore more of a feature so people can relax and enjoy the sea aspect without worrying about traffic.</li> <li>4. It notes the lack of car parking for businesses in the western side of the village continues to be a problem and needs addressing.</li> <li>5. It supports the objectives of protecting the marine related industry of repair and storage of Crosshaven Boatyard in paragraph 1.6.39 and notes the upgrading and development of the boatyard will be a major boost for Crosshaven.</li> <li>6. Supports how the plan depicts Camden Fort Meagher, as it fits very well with the overall vision for Crosshaven.</li> <li>7. It notes Objective CS-GO-07 relating to infrastructure for Graball is really at emergency status with houses being flooded during winter and should be a priority.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted. The plan aims to reflect existing walkways and long-established routes and includes indicative routes, such as CS-U-01 and CS-U-02. Objective CS-GO-06, states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</li> <li>3. Noted and GO-02 refers to the expansion of facilities requiring to be compatible with the nature conservations designations in the area. facilities.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> <li>5. Noted</li> <li>6. Noted.</li> <li>7. Noted. Flooding is a key issue identified in Graball and is included in the policy objective CS-GO-07.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 No amendment required.</li> <li>2 See amendment no. 1.18.8</li> <li>3 No amendment required</li> <li>4 No amendment required</li> <li>5 No amendment required</li> <li>6 No amendment required.</li> <li>7 No amendment required</li> </ol>

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Crosshaven Rugby Football Club</b>
<b>DCDP344691455</b>	DCDP344691455
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards objectives CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 outlined in the Draft Cork County Development Plan which cut across Crosshaven Rugby Football Club's grounds. The submissions details where the walkway dissects the private grounds and includes maps to illustrate.</p> <p>It states there are no existing public rights of way to pass through Crosshaven Rugby Football Club's grounds and they are not disposed to grant any such right of way.</p> <p>The submission states all portions of the grounds are in full use and notes that the idea that people will walk or cycle through playing pitches and a training area is neither sensible nor acceptable.</p> <p>The submission requests confirmation that the idea of creating a walk/cycle way through Crosshaven Rugby Football Club's grounds will be abandoned.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issues raised regarding the walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 as they dissect farmland in Crosshaven and Bays.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes. Objective CS-GO-06 states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes.</p> <p>Amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See Amendment no. 1.18.8
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Damian Madejski</b>
<b>DCDP345906196</b>	DCDP345906196
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable</p>

	walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dan McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP344302169</b>	DCDP344302169
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards a 6.5 hectare landholding in Ballynametagh Carrigaline which has road frontage of approximately 300 metres on the N28 route from the Shannonpark Roundabout to Ringaskiddy. Two maps were included in the submission to outline the site and its location.</p> <p>The submission requests that the lands be zoned to be included within the development boundary of the town, and that the zoning for industrial and related uses including facilities such as warehousing/open storage/light industry be considered also. It states this may address the possibility of future residential/employment/leisure needs of the Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy areas taking into account the future implementation of the M28 route.</p> <p>It states the locational advantages of the lands provide access onto the existing N28 and may facilitate sustainable transportation modes to the Ringaskiddy employment zone.</p> <p>The submission notes that a separate submission of the adjoining landowner could be considered in conjunction with this submission for similar options.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission requests lands be zoned for residential or industrial and related uses and be included in the development boundary of Carrigaline.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dan O'Riordan</b>
<b>DCDP344803022</b>	DCDP344803022
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to 15.2 ha of land shown as part of the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area (UEA) and zoned as High Technology Campus Development and Business and General Employment in the Draft Plan. Welcomes the

	<p>proposed zoning which supports Ringaskiddy as a designated Strategic Employment Centre and, by providing more job opportunities in Carrigaline, will reduce car-based commuting.</p> <p>Notes the requirement in the Draft Plan for the preparation of a framework masterplan for Fernhill Urban Expansion Area in consultation with landowners and also the recently published Draft Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (CTPREP). Submits that the proposed transport network as set out in the CTPREP, already provides a strong framework master plan for the Fernhill Expansion Area and negates the requirement for an additional framework master plan. The proposed transport network includes the provision of a new Eastern Outer distributor roadway around the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area, supported by new local access roads connecting to Heron’s Wood and Janeville and the proposal includes new footpaths and cycle facilities. It is submitted that the level of detail in the CTPREP, allows for the development of the lands in a coherent and integrated manner, without the requirement of an additional framework masterplan and that given the substantial lands in the UEA in their ownership (42%), these lands could be brought forward without being contingent on consultation with multiple landowners.</p> <p>Requests the removal of the requirement for the preparation of a framework plan and allow the detailed transport network in the CTPREP guide future development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests the removal of the requirement for the preparation of a framework plan and allow the detailed transport network in the CTPREP guide future development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Carrigaline is the largest town in the County and has experienced significant population and housing growth over a long period of time. Also, there is a lack of sufficient employment land within the town which influences the high car dependency. IDA have indicated that there is a requirement to identify additional employment lands in the area. The proposal to develop the Fernhill UEA is a prudent and strategic response to these strategic issues ensuring that future housing and employment land supply is properly planned for over the lifetime of the Plan. The proposal has been fully assessed as part of the preparation of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Strategy (TPREP) to ensure that it has strong sustainable walking and cycling links with the town and the town centre to encourage modal shift away from cars. Development of these lands will be subject to other lands been developed or shown not to be available and subject to the opening of the M28 and the preparation of a Framework Plan which will address the issues raised.</p> <p>The Local Authority consider the identification of these lands for more detailed planning over the lifetime of the Plan is a prudent proper planning approach to help guide the future development of Carrigaline in a sustainable manner.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dawn O Leary</b>
<b>DCDP346203630</b>	DCDP346203630
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states they are pleased to see the Fernhill Expansion Area Plan. It notes there is a need for employment and more housing in Carrigaline as the community grows, and states it is great that it will create jobs and infrastructure.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Deepak Kumar</b>
<b>DCDP345070509</b>	DCDP345070509
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Deirdre O'Reilly</b>
<b>DCDP346087567</b>	DCDP346087567
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be

	well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Denis Allen</b>
<b>DCDP346116386</b>	DCDP346116386
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dorota Szumanska</b>
<b>DCDP345925828</b>	DCDP345925828
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a

	<p>result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose. The submission then describes how to make a submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>See amendment 4.1.5.4.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Dorothy Creedon</b></p>
<b>DCDP346225468</b>	<p>DCDP346225468</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as</p>



	Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dr. Dara Fitzpatrick</b>
<b>DCDP346300468</b>	DCDP346300468
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>It states paragraph 1.6.9 should be rejected for the following reasons: It notes Objective CS-X-01 should be deleted, as it is a small site in the heart of the village which is of high nature value. It states the council acknowledges it is 'a highly sensitive site' yet supports its development for a hotel, these are incompatible. It states the council should adhere to ABP's adjudication. It states its development would be damaging to the character of the village and Crosshaven House and references the affect it would have on specimen trees, which should have individual protection orders, and on Leisler Bats in the village which have decreased in population due to habitat loss.</p> <p>It states paragraph 1.6.22 should be rejected for the following reasons: It states CS-T-01 should not be extended and should be rezoned as amenity and recreational. It notes Crosshaven is a village, and the current use is a fairground, and it is the only flat and level area in the village. It notes should it come to the market the council should purchase the site for a village park for the elderly population to use, as there is currently none. It states this will take pressure off the foreshore which is threatened will infill development continuously. It notes the council are obliged to prevent such development on the foreshore. It states Point House, a listed building, was not considered in the extension of CS-T-01. It states the village centre should be designated as an architectural heritage zone.</p> <p>It states paragraph 1.6.24 and 1.6.38 should be rejected for the following reasons: It states the town centre sites should be rezoned to protect them and provide amenities within the village. It notes all comments in the draft relating to 'town centre' should be changed to 'village centre' reflecting the special character of Crosshaven.</p> <p>It states paragraph 1.6.49 should be rejected for the following reasons: It notes the council has already reneged on its obligation to protect the bats by granting permission for multi-storey apartment next to the colony based on a bat report which never carried a survey in the breeding season.</p> <p>It states paragraph 1.6.54 should be rejected for the following reasons: It notes the development of CS-X-01 should be prevented as no intervention can be sensitive to the site.</p> <p>It states CS-X-01 should be rejected for the following reasons: It states the site is untenable.</p> <p>It states CS-I-01 should be rejected for the following reasons: It highlights that no structures should be built on this site, as the site is sitting on the</p>

	<p>foreshore and has no foreshore lease as far as is known. It states arguably this site is in public ownership and any change of use should be open to public consultation.</p> <p>It notes the draft fails to mention any provision for green infrastructure for e-bikes and charging points or a desire to reduce the number of cars passing through the village. It states satellite parking and park and ride facilities should be provided with the help of landowners on busy days, referencing Cork Week. It requests that all the farmland around Templebreedy Church be zoned Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p> <p>The submission states the Owenaboy SPA should be protected from end to end and recent agitation for a bridge across the estuary should be dismissed. The submission includes a link to the Owenabue Estuary Bridge website.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states paragraph 1.6.9 should be rejected. It states its development would be damaging to the character of the village and Crosshaven House and references the affect it would have on specimen trees, which should have individual protection orders, and on Leisler Bats in the village which have decreased in population due to habitat loss.</li> <li>2. It states paragraph 1.6.22 should be rejected for the following reasons: It states CS-T-01 should not be extended and should be rezoned as amenity and recreational. It notes Crosshaven is a village, and the current use is a fairground, and it is the only flat and level area in the village. It notes should it come to the market the council should purchase the site for a village park for the elderly population to use, as there is currently none. It states this will take pressure off the foreshore which is threatened will infill development continuously.</li> <li>3. It states the village centre should be designated as an architectural heritage zone.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. It states paragraph 1.6.24 and 1.6.38 should be rejected as the town centre sites should be rezoned to protect them and provide amenities within the village.</li> <li>5. It notes all comments in the draft relating to 'town centre' should be changed to 'village centre' reflecting the special character of Crosshaven.</li> <li>6. It states paragraph 1.6.49 should be rejected, the council has already reneged on its obligation to protect the bats by granting permission for multi-storey apartment next to the colony based on a bat report which never carried a survey in the breeding season.</li> <li>7. It states paragraph 1.6.54 should be rejected as the development of CS-X-01 should be prevented as no intervention can be sensitive to the site.</li> <li>8. It states CS-I-01 should be rejected. It highlights that no structures should be built on this site, as the site is sitting on the foreshore and has no foreshore lease as far as is known. It states arguably this site is in public ownership and any change of use should be open to public consultation.</li> <li>9. It notes the draft fails to mention any provision for green infrastructure for e-bikes and charging points or a desire to reduce the number of cars passing through the village.</li> <li>10. It states satellite parking and park and ride facilities should be provided with the help of landowners on busy days, referencing Cork Week.</li> <li>11. It requests that all the farmland around Templebreedy Church be zoned Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>12. The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>13. The submission states the Owenaboy SPA should be protected from end to end and recent agitation for a bridge across the estuary should be dismissed. The submission includes a link to the Owenabue Estuary Bridge website.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CS-X-01 has provision to accommodate tourist accommodation on a sensitive site. All development on the site is subject to a landscaping scheme and the retention of the existing tree belt. The sensitive nature of the site requires innovative design to best reflect and protect the unique nature of the site. No change to the objective is required. The objective is reflective of the sensitive nature of the site giving its location in the village and proximity to Crosshaven House. The detailing of the site would have to be a part of any proposal for development on the site.</li> <li>2. Noted. CS-T-01 was extended to include the vision for Crosshaven and Bays and promote future development in the key village. Existing uses on the site will be noted and their continuation will be permissible within the town centre zoning. The purchasing of land is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Noted. The Planning Authority may review and update the list number of Architectural Conservation Areas in the County, where resources allow. Recommend additional text to 16.3.13: The Planning Authority may review and update the list number of Architectural Conservation Areas in the County, where resources allow. See Amendment 1.16.10. t</li> <li>4. The inclusion of these paragraphs is considered appropriate in relation to the proper planning and sustainable development of Crosshaven and Bays.</li> <li>5. Under Chapter 18 Land Use and Zoning town and village centre sites fall under the objective ZU 18-17: Town Centres/ Neighbourhood Centres. As Crosshaven and Bays is a Key Village with a population over 1,500 the zonings for town centre are deemed more appropriate than neighbourhood centre as the village is more advanced.</li> <li>6. 1.6.49 outlines important conservation sites in Crosshaven and Bays. It is imperative to include their protection within the plan, particularly in relation to bat species.</li> <li>7. All development on the site is subject to a landscaping scheme and the retention of the existing tree belt. Paragraph 1.6.54 will be retained in the plan.</li> <li>8. CS-I-01 is already an existing dockyard under maritime use. Any development on this site will need to take account of the biodiversity sensitivities, which have county importance, within the site and area.</li> <li>9. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility TM 12.8: Traffic/Mobility Management and Road Safety addresses this. Providing e-bikes and charging points is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>10. The plan will not include the provision for a park and ride facility in the key village as this would potentially entail the extension of the development boundary and ongoing consultation with landowners.</li> <li>11. The subject lands are located outside the development boundary of Crosshaven and Bays, therefore will not be zoned for Green Infrastructure. Templebreedy National School pNHA is protected through policy in the plan. CS-U-04 walkway links Templebreedy to Church Bay and is supported within the plan.</li> <li>12. The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</li> <li>13. Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment addresses the protection of the SPA in Section 15.3 Protecting Sites, Habitats and Species – Legislative Context.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1-11 No Amendment Required  12. See amendment 4.1.5.4.  13 No Amendment Required</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Eileen Ashyan</b>

<b>DCDP346224350</b>	DCDP346224350
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Elaine Nicholson and Brian Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345664283</b>	DCDP345664283
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 and states the submitters are local residents living in close proximity to the proposed amenity walkways and are opposed to the development of these walkways for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Anti-social behaviour - the submission states the area already suffers from an element of anti-social behaviour such as underage drinking and littering and the proposal to develop these walkways invites more unacceptable levels of same.</p> <p>2) Impact on wildlife - the submission notes the area for the proposed walkways is rich in wildlife, that numerous species would be displaced, and there could be a potential adverse impact on both the wildlife and local farms. It notes there are Badger sets where the walkway is proposed that could lead to a spread of TB across a number of farms.</p> <p>3) Existing local amenities - the submission highlights that the Crosshaven area currently has amenities that require development and not abandonment. It refers to Cruachain wood, a local amenity that was used by locals, and states it has been destroyed by housing development with no</p>

	consideration for the preservation of the natural walkway. The submission notes there are multiple cliff walks and scenic coastal routes in the locality that have also not been maintained.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission raises issues with the CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 walkways which dissect farmlands in Crosshaven and Bays, in relation to anti-social behaviour, and impact on wildlife.</li> <li>2. Notes there has been numerous walks and scenic routes which have not been maintained.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The plan aims to reflect long-established walkways while also includes indicative routes, such as CS-U-01 and CS-U-02. The indicative walking routes CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996 and objective CS-GO-06 states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See also amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</li> <li>2. The Plan continues to support long established walkways in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. However, the maintenance of these routes is not within the remit of the Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Emma Frawley</b>
<b>DCDP346290983</b>	DCDP346290983
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC-03 Identify the Marsh as a pNHA with Protected Species.</li> <li>• C-01 Existing school, allow for designated parking for school staff, safety measures around the school such as a school bus set down area.</li> <li>• U-01 Change site of proposed amenity walk that is currently proposed to begin in the River Valley estate.</li> <li>• U-02 Extend amenity walk from Minane to Fountainstown.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GC-03 Identify the Marsh as a pNHA with Protected Species.</li> <li>2. C-01 Existing school, allow for designated parking for school staff, safety measures around the school such as a school bus set down area.</li> <li>3. U-01 Change site of proposed amenity walk that is currently proposed to begin in the River Valley estate.</li> <li>4. U-02 Extend amenity walk from Minane to Fountainstown.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The boundary of Minane Bridge adjoins the Minane Bridge Marsh pNHA. New development should be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection of this wetland and will only be permitted where it is shown that it is compatible with the requirements of with environmental, biodiversity and landscape protection policies as set out in Volume One Main Policy Material</li> </ol>

	<p>and Volume Two Heritage and Amenity. Include new General Objective to reference Minane Marsh pNHA in Table 4.1.26.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. This is not within the remit of the Plan.</li> <li>3. The indicative route for the path overlaps with the boundary of the Minane Bridge Marsh pNHA, will be tweaked so that it is shown to be outside the pNHA. Amend wording to Objective U-01 in Minane Bridge in Table 4.1.26.</li> <li>4. The plan supports long established walkways throughout the county. No amendment will result from this issue raised.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See amendment 4.1.10.1.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. See amendment 4.1.10.2.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Eoin O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345932826</b>	DCDP345932826
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ewa Plichta</b>
<b>DCDP345926731</b>	DCDP345926731
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the</p>



	parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose. The submission then describes how to make a submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fahy Construction Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346169743</b>	DCDP346169743
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land within the zoning PW-R-01. It included a location map in the context of Passage West. The submission requests alterations to the wording of the PW-R-01 zoning objective in the County Development Plan, such as the following text being omitted: low density residential development individual services sites adjacent to a woodland setting. It states this would allow greater flexibility in achieving the ultimate goal of delivering residential development at the subject lands. It requested that the County Plan 2022-2028 adopt the following amended zoning objective for the PW-R-01 lands: Medium B Density Development.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission requests alterations to the wording of the PW-R-01 zoning objective in the County Development Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is a need to protect the woodland setting adjacent to PW-R-01 within the zoning objective. PW-R-01 site has been reduced to remove the curtilage of Aldi and an existing dwelling to the rear of Aldi. See amendment 4.1.4.3.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fernhill Lodge</b>
<b>DCDP345942714</b>	DCDP345942714
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission regards a site c.33.18ha in area, located off the Fernhill Road to the northeast of Carrigaline, opposite the Janeville housing

	<p>development, which comprises of the former Fernhill Golf Course as well as Fernhill Lodge, 10 holiday homes and a family dwelling. The site is bounded to the east by a local road connecting the N28 and Fernhill Road; a stone quarry to the immediate north-east of the site; individual dwellings along the Fernhill Road to the north; and agricultural land to the south.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing policy from the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP), Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP). It states the proposal to extend the development boundary for Carrigaline to incorporate the subject lands and to rezone them for a mix of uses to be aligned with national and regional planning policy. The submission included maps to illustrate the site.</p> <p>The submission includes Cushman and Wakefield’s Industrial Market Overview June 2021 as an Appendix. It highlighted points such as that there is market evidence of a shortage in family homes in Carrigaline, which will only worsen with the increase in quality jobs in the Ringaskiddy area, and that there remains strong interest from the Global Capital Markets for quality investments in the office and industrial markets, although there is a lack of trading stock, and references Fernhill and CL-HT-01. See submission for further details.</p> <p>It states it is important to be able to respond to potential economic opportunities for the Carrigaline area that can assist in addressing current market demands as well as offsetting the current significantly unsustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>It outlines that a large proportion of the zoned residential lands in Carrigaline in the draft Plan have been zoned as such for successive LAPs, as far back as 2005.</p> <p>The submission requests that consideration is given to rezoning that part of the subject lands from a residential reserve (CL-RR-01) to Residential (RE), having regard to their key attributes and the fact that a significant quantum of existing zoned residential land has not been brought forward for development in Carrigaline for over 16 years. It notes the subject lands are in single ownership, are available for development, are relatively constraint free and can be serviced, and will contribute to future population, housing and jobs targets for Carrigaline consistent with the strategic role of the town in the settlement hierarchy for the County. It states it will support the case for, and benefit from, the delivery of the permitted and proposed infrastructure, particularly those for sustainable transportation modes in the town, in particular the Greenway along the former N28.</p> <p>It requests the inclusion of the following reference in the amended Plan regarding Fernhill: The masterplan to be prepared for the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area will determine the nature and extent of development, including appropriate</p>
--	---

	uses, as well as the phasing of development, linked to infrastructure delivery.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states it is important to be able to respond to potential economic opportunities for the Carrigaline area that can assist in addressing current market demands as well as offsetting the current significantly unsustainable travel patterns.</li> <li>2. It outlines that a large proportion of the zoned residential lands in Carrigaline in the draft Plan have been zoned as such for successive LAPs, as far back as 2005.</li> <li>3. Requests that consideration is given to rezoning that part of the subject lands from a residential reserve (CL-RR-01) to Residential (RE).</li> <li>4. Requests the wording be amended regarding Fernhill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carrigaline is the largest town in the County and has experienced significant population and housing growth over a long period of time. Also, there is a lack of sufficient employment land within the town which influences the high car dependency. IDA have indicated that there is a requirement to identify additional employment lands in the area. The proposal to develop the Fernhill UEA is a prudent and strategic response to these issues ensuring that future housing and employment land supply is properly planned for over the lifetime of the Plan. The proposal has been fully assessed as part of the preparation of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Strategy (TPREP) to ensure that it has strong sustainable walking and cycling links with the town and the town centre to encourage modal shift away from cars. Development of these lands will be subject to other lands been developed or shown not to be available and subject to the opening of the M28 and the preparation of a Framework Plan which will address the issues raised.</li> <li>2. The Local Authority consider the identification of these lands for more detailed planning over the lifetime of the Plan as the prudent proper planning approach to help guide the future development of Carrigaline in a sustainable manner. It is intended to revise the requirements of the Framework Plan to ensure that the future development of the site makes provision for a strategic landscape corridor with Ringaskiddy to be retained.</li> <li>3. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>4. No change in wording is required regarding Fernhill Urban Expansion Area. Additional wording has been included in CL-RR-01. See amendment no. 4.1.3.20.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Finbar Whyte and Helen Drislane</b>
<b>DCDP345267927</b>	DCDP345267927

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission objects to the proposed zoning of land under the submitter's ownership in the Draft County Development Plan 2022-2028. It states their property is within the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area and in the Draft Plan is included and encapsulated within the proposed zoning CL-B-02. The following form the basis of the objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It notes the property is an established Family residence since 1979 on 3 acres directly accessing Fernhill Road - planning Ref. No. 2787/79. The submission included the registered property folios and other maps to illustrate.</li> <li>2. It states the proposed zone CL-B-02 does not include existing dwellings directly bordering the south of that zone, and that to be consistent, their residential property should also be excluded from CL-B-02.</li> <li>3. It notes the proposed zone CL-RR-01 directly borders the property on the north side. It states maintaining the adjoining property as residential is therefore consistent with that zoning.</li> </ol> <p>The submission requests that the Council maintain the status of the family dwelling and land as residential and change the maps accordingly.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests existing dwelling be zoned within the Residential Reserve as opposed to within a Business zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan aims to reflect the most appropriate zonings in strategic locations. It is noted that this existing dwelling is not compatible with the business zoning zoned under the Draft Plan. The curtilage of the house will be placed within the zoning Existing Residential, Mixed Residential and Other Uses. Amendment required to alter the boundary of CL-B-02 to remove existing dwelling.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.3.2.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gavin Owens</b>
<b>DCDP346266750</b>	DCDP346266750
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states Carrigaline is a very car dependent town, and car journeys are forced upon locals as there are no safe cycling infrastructure. It states there is no east/west link and only one north/south link which is on a raised footpath, is shared with pedestrians, stops abruptly, has no priority at junctions and is not two way.</p> <p>The submission proposes the following as a Specific Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That existing cycle lanes on the R611 be segregated from both traffic and pedestrians and widened to two carriageways as far as Carrigaline Industrial estate.</li> <li>• That there be a two-way East/West segregated cycleway from the new Brookhill Development terminating in Haulbowline. It states this would serve numerous housing developments, Holy Well national school Main campus and senior academy, Carrigaline soccer club, hotel, and allow active travel to Ringaskiddy and would intersect with the existing North to Southeast link.</li> <li>• It suggests that to facilitate this route motor traffic on the R613 church road should be reduced to one lane from the junction with Rock Road and junction at Coolmore Lodges. It states this road should only be used for local access but is used extensively by commuters. It proposes to close the</li> </ul>

	<p>inbound lane to Carrigaline as this would cause the least disruption, and would also facilitate the building of a footpath. It states along this area there are numerous houses with no way accessing Carrigaline, Shanbally or Ringaskiddy except by car, however all three are in easy walking and cycling distance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states a North/South Link can be achieved starting from the new school campus on the Ballinrea Road via Dun Eoin and Ballea Woods to join the new inner relief road onto the lower Kilmoney road, and should continue around to the upper Kilmoney road and across to the Ferney Road where it can again join existing infrastructure by Forest Hill.</li> <li>• It requests a cycle lane from New Campus on Ballinrea Road to where existing infrastructure starts on at Gael Scoil Carrigaline at the entrance to Heatherfield.</li> <li>• It requests a junction of Upper and Lower Kilmoney Road. It states the footpath that runs along the edge of Upper Clevedon ends, and to continue walking back around towards town centre pedestrians need to cross the Lower Kilmoney Road to the footpath running beside Wrenville on a bend at a busy junction. It notes there is no pedestrian crossing. It states at approximately 300m down this path ends on a junction with Forest and pedestrians must cross the Lower Kilmoney Road again, and that this path could be extended to run along beside Upper Clevedon until it links in with existing footpath.</li> <li>• It states there are no footpaths on Station Road. It states Holy Well National School senior academy (Senior Infants Only) Pupils and Parents exit the school directly onto the road. It states it is also a busy thoroughfare for secondary school pupils accessing the Community school. It notes the building only has two entry points, with only one being accessible as the other is stepped. It notes it is currently used as the only exit due to Covid restrictions meaning all pupils all aged 5-7 are exiting directly onto a road. It states there should be no parking allowed on Station Road. It requests a footpath and cycle lane be installed with a lay by halfway to facilitate two-way traffic to pass but it should be restricted to local access for residents and those accessing the businesses.</li> </ul> <p>It states this proposed infrastructure makes a number of critical links that currently account for a huge number of daily car journeys in Carrigaline. It notes it allows an active travel link between Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy, which could have a massive impact on traffic congestion in Carrigaline. It notes it may mean in certain limited areas that cars may need to be diverted along longer routes to facilitate the construction of cycle lanes to NTA standards but this will be mitigated by the overall reduction in traffic on these roads.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issues raised regarding local Municipal District issues such as connectivity in relation to footpaths and roads, availability of access in areas within the town and public facilities, such as schools, in Carrigaline.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The issues raised are addressed in the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP), which elements of, such as insert maps and text, will be included in the plan. Elements, such as insert maps/figures/text of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm

	<p>Enhancement Plan will be included into Volume 4, Chapter 1, Carrigaline Municipal District. See Amendment 4.1.3.21.</p> <p>The majority of the issues raised are operational and are beyond the remit of the development plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ger Greaney</b>
<b>DCDP346121908</b>	DCDP346121908
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Geraldine O'Shea</b>
<b>DCDP346133340</b>	DCDP346133340
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees.</p>

	It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gobnait O'Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP345580335</b>	DCDP345580335
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands situated in Kilmoney, Carrigaline West, approximately 1.5km west of Carrigaline town centre, immediately south of the Owenboy River. It states the site is serviceable in both water and wastewater facilities, and is bounded to the south by established residential development and the remainder of the site is bounded by agricultural lands.</p> <p>The submission provides context to Carrigaline, discussing its status as a Metropolitan Town, the significant amount of development which took place over the last few years, and its distinctive identity as a Metropolitan Town which serves as an important residential alternative to Cork City and its Environs. The submission included maps to illustrate the location of the site.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP).</p> <p>It states if Carrigaline is to deliver on its strategic function as a Metropolitan Town, driving growth at a sub-regional level, the strategic planning policy context must support viable housing development during the lifetime of the forthcoming Development Plan. It states it considers that the quantum of residentially zoned lands within the Shannonpark masterplan area may not be adequate to support the housing targets in the short to medium term due to the requirement for significant infrastructure provision. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term. It notes the Draft CDP has identified new lands for employment uses to the north of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02), and there will need to be</p>



	<p>housing development delivered in tandem to the employment lands to reduce car-based commuting.</p> <p>It states the relief road, under construction, will unlock the development potential of lands to the west of the town, and alleviate traffic congestion on Carrigaline’s main street, allowing compact growth to occur within the town. It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council’s Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>It states the worsening housing crisis, compounded by the Covid-19 emergency and the construction shutdowns since March 2020, means the delivery of housing in prime locations is imperative. It states the local authority must consider the best and most efficient ways of delivering housing units in the short to medium term.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new residential zoning objective CL-R-16: Medium A Residential Development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests a new zoning for residential development in Carrigaline and includes an objective for the site.</li> <li>2. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term.</li> <li>3. It notes the Draft CDP has identified new lands for employment uses to the north of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02), and there will need to be housing development delivered in tandem to the employment lands to reduce car-based commuting.</li> <li>4. It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council’s Climate Action Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. Noted. Chapter 2, Core Strategy addresses the land supply needed to deliver housing units to meet future projected growth.</li> <li>3. Noted. The Fernhill Urban Expansion Area (UEA) is subject to the delivery of the M28 and is subject to a framework master plan. A site zoned residential reserve is also located within the Fernhill UEA</li> </ol>

	<p>the delivery of which and the delivery of the employment lands will be set out in the framework master plan.</p> <p>4. Noted. The plan will include elements, such as maps and text from the Carrigaline TPREP. Include elements of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Enhancement Plan into Volume 4, Chapter 1, Carrigaline Municipal District..</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1 No amendment required.</p> <p>2 No amendment required</p> <p>3 No amendment required</p> <p>4 See Amendment 4.1.3.21</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gordon &amp; Keith Bryan</b>
<b>DCDP345682321</b>	DCDP345682321
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands in Waterfall. The submission welcomes this development plan which encourages the development of up to 22 additional dwellings in the period 2020-2028. It notes there are many people who have grown up in Waterfall who were unable to build or purchase housing in the area. It states that when the development boundary for Waterfall was introduced it was productive in releasing lands for the development of Heatherfield and Earls Well. It states this has stagnated since then and there is a requirement to increase the development boundary to release lands to meet the development objective for 2020-2028. The submission includes a map illustrating the site.</p> <p>The basis of this submission is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states these lands should be included within the development boundary of Waterfall, as it would consolidate and strengthen the existing village core, sympathetic to the character of the village giving ample pedestrian facilities.</li> <li>• It states it would release serviced sites for one off rural housing without further increasing the ribbon development of Waterfall, giving a balanced village by developing the centre point of the village rather than just one end,</li> <li>• It notes the site offers the most significant road frontage boundary in the village, allowing the development of a new town centre with ample green space sympathetic to the character of the village.</li> <li>• It emphasises that including these lands within the development boundary would facilitate a link to the local forested area which could potentially provide a direct link between Ballinora and Ballymah, and more directly between the two GAA pitches, offering an off road link between Waterfall and Ballinora.</li> <li>• It states as the lands are adjacent to the GAA pitch in Ballymah, an adjoining village park and recreational area could be included within the development to create a focal point for Waterfall, which would offer a fantastic amenity for the area. It states the town centre should be located as outlined in the included map, as a more centered focal point to the village.</li> <li>• It states that a village park and recreational area on the subject lands would contribute to providing a much needed focal point along with a small town centre development providing local retail, services and a remote</li> </ul>

	<p>working hub which would contribute to building a sustainable village.</p> <p>The submission requests to contribute to the further development of Waterfall into a sustainable village with a living centre which provides a focal point of recreation and services for the community.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests lands be included within the development boundary of Waterfall, as it would consolidate and strengthen the existing village core, sympathetic to the character of the village giving ample pedestrian facilities and would provide residential units and a recreational area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Green Rebel Marine</b>
<b>DCDP346280856</b>	DCDP346280856
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards sites in Crosshaven and Bays. The submission states a Masterplan is being prepared for the subject sites and requests to engage with Cork County Council to deliver their exciting vision for the site. It states the vision includes the potential development of a pier to facilitate the expansion of the strategic marine based storage and manufacturing uses, in addition to the redevelopment and expansion of the existing marina for leisure craft. It states given its strategic town centre location, the site is an appropriate location for retail, residential and office uses, and highlights that the extent of residential uses, in addition its appropriate protection will be provided for within the Masterplan.</p> <p>The submission suggests a special policy area objective to be the most appropriate for the site to facilitate its appropriate master planning in consultation with Cork County Council.</p> <p>It states the draft plan represents two separate objectives across the subject site and the boundary between both zoning objectives might become a constraint. It states the proposed zoning objective is a site-specific blend of the two objectives mentioned in the draft plan, includes the additional mention of a pier, and will give much greater flexibility to the master planning design process. The submission includes maps to illustrate.</p> <p>The submission requests the following new objective to be included in Table 4.1.20: Special Policy Areas, Objective No. CS-X-03: Support the redevelopment of Crosshaven Boatyard in accordance with a masterplan to be agreed with Cork County Council. The masterplan will provide for potential development of a pier to facilitate the expansion of the strategic marine based storage and manufacturing uses, in addition to the redevelopment and expansion of the existing marina and associated facilities to support leisure craft and tourism. The masterplan will also provide mixed uses including strategic</p>

	<p>marine related repair, manufacturing, storage and associated facilities, as well as the potential for retail, offices, residential and tourism development.</p> <p>The following wording is requested in Section 1.6.12: Boat-building and repairs is also long established economic activity in the village and the Council will continue to support this important marine-based use. A masterplan for the redevelopment of Crosshaven Boatyard zoned CS-X-03 will protect and expand strategic boat repair/ storage site activities in addition to the potential development of a pier to facilitate the expansion of the strategic marine based storage and manufacturing uses. The masterplan will investigate the potential redevelopment and expansion of the existing marina for leisure craft and appropriate retail, offices, residential and tourism development.</p> <p>The submission outlines a detailed site description of the Crosshaven Boatyard, stating the main site is 7.5 acres and the waterfront site is approximately 1.68 acres. It notes the two sites are separated by the Point Road and includes maps to illustrate. It details the topography, relationship to the waterfront, and the village amenities that lie to the south of the site. It states most of the site is undeveloped.</p> <p>It outlines Crosshaven and Bays role from a high-level documentation perspective, referencing policy from the County Development Plan 2014, and the Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017.</p> <p>The submission outlines the planning history of the site and references flood risk.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests the following new objective to be included in Table 4.1.20: Special Policy Areas, Objective No. CS-X-03: Support the redevelopment of Crosshaven Boatyard in accordance with a masterplan to be agreed with Cork County Council. The masterplan will provide for potential development of a pier to facilitate the expansion of the strategic marine based storage and manufacturing uses, in addition to the redevelopment and expansion of the existing marina and associated facilities to support leisure craft and tourism. The masterplan will also provide mixed uses including strategic marine related repair, manufacturing, storage and associated facilities, as well as the potential for retail, offices, residential and tourism development.</li> <li>2. The following wording is requested in Section 1.6.12: Boat-building and repairs is also long established economic activity in the village and the Council will continue to support this important marine-based use. A masterplan for the redevelopment of Crosshaven Boatyard zoned CS-X-03 will protect and expand strategic boat repair/ storage site activities in addition to the potential development of a pier to facilitate the expansion of the strategic marine based storage and manufacturing uses. The masterplan will investigate the potential redevelopment and expansion of the</li> </ol>

	existing marina for leisure craft and appropriate retail, offices, residential and tourism development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The town centre zoning CS-T-01 reflects the Planning Authority's long-term vision for the town centre in Crosshaven and Bays, while acknowledging the uses on the site. The maritime activities to the north in CS-T-01 still as scope to continue its uses within the CS-T-01 zoning. See amendment no. 4.1.6.7.</li> <li>2. The subject site are remaining as currently zoned in the Draft Plan, RY-I-01, RY-I-02 and RY-T-01. Refer to response above.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Guy Woodroffe</b>
<b>DCDP345013277</b>	DCDP345013277
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submissions acknowledges its support for the draft plan. It notes there is a lack of infrastructure in Crosshaven and Bays. It states there is a need to protect coastal areas from one off construction of big properties and consideration from Cork County Council needs to be given to stop these types of building. It notes wastewater going untreated into the harbour and beautiful coastline has to stop. It requests that the established walks be protected and notes that many are missing off the County Development Plan, and requests for more walks to be input into the County Development Plan as it is important to retain these for future generations.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It notes there is a lack of infrastructure in Crosshaven and Bays.</li> <li>2. It states there is a need to protect coastal areas from one off construction of big properties and consideration from Cork County Council needs to be given to stop these types of building.</li> <li>3. It notes wastewater going untreated into the harbour and beautiful coastline has to stop.</li> <li>4. It requests that the established walks be protected and notes that many are missing off the County Development Plan, and requests for more walks to be input into the County Development Plan as it is important to retain these for future generations.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective CS-GO -07 addresses the issue of lack of infrastructure in Crosshaven and Bays. The council is supportive of the objective to seek an extension of the Crosshaven public sewer network to serve the Graball area. Any new development should be accompanied by surface water attenuation solutions on site</li> <li>2. Noted. Objective CS-GO-08 addresses this issue. It states the level of development permitted within the Bays will include appropriate individual residential development only, and that new dwelling house design and scale needs to be respectful of the character and pattern of existing dwellings while fitting appropriately into the elevated setting of this coastal area of high value landscape overlooking Cork Harbour.</li> <li>3. Noted. Objective CS-GO-07 states that any new development should be accompanied by surface water attenuation solutions on site.</li> </ol>

	<p>4. The plan supports the provision of walkways in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Helen O'Dowd</b>
<b>DCDP346126826</b>	DCDP346126826
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission includes comments on flooding risk, water quality and the risks of the proposed developments to critically important habitats in the Minane Bridge and Fountainstown Bay areas.</p> <p>It states this is made in the context of the stated vision for Minane Bridge, Groundwater Protection, Development in Flood Risk Areas, Climate Change Considerations, The Planning System and Flood Risk Management and River Basin management Planning.</p> <p>The submission outlined the following observations and concerns:</p> <p>It states the amenity Walk U-01, encroaches into the identified flood risk area and requests this path be altered to allow for inevitable flooding, to retain the willows and have in addition a green corridor and pollinator meadow, the planting of which be in consultation with Tracton Biodiversity Group. It states the consideration that 'The development is assessed not to have the potential to give rise to negative or adverse impacts on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites (Vol 1)' applies in this instance to pNHA site Minane Marsh.</p> <p>It states Minane Marsh is a pNHA area and this site comprises the narrow Ringabella estuary incorporating flooded wet fields supporting marsh vegetation and colonising woodland. It notes the site is important for birds, butterflies and other insects and that biodiversity has suffered increasing destruction due to drainage and other groundworks. It notes the most protected species in that area and states it deserves protection and restoration to high ecological status. It states there is considerable risk from flooding already, where the effects of drainage and increased water levels due to rainfall are causing concern for residents of River Valley estate. It states mitigation would consist of the protection and restoration of Minane Marsh as an amenity for locals and tourists.</p> <p>It states unpurified water is entering Fountainstown beach, a Blue Flag beach. It references Volume 1:11.3.1.</p> <p>It states currently Otters, Black Tailed Godwit and Borrers Salt Marsh Grass are the most protected species in Minane River.</p> <p>It notes regarding Minane River, that there are two outfalls from estates and raw sewage from Spruce Grove estate. It recommends that water samples are taken regularly and monitoring for the impact of associated toxins on biodiversity of riverbank, freshwater marsh, saltwater marsh by the dam, and in the SPA below it. It states a Cork Harbour SPA is within the estuary of the Minane River, at Ringabella Creek. It notes in Objective U-01 that the proposed path appears to overlap the WWTP reedbed, which is an</p>

	<p>integral part of the existing WWTP and any interference in the reedbed has potential impact on water quality. It states the wastewater treatment plant for River Valley estate is not outlined in the draft plan and requests that this be identified and marked as sensitive infrastructure.</p> <p>It notes there is a diversity of geological features and habitats in the area and requests that the Minane River valley be treated with the same consideration as locations on the list of Priority Areas for Action in Vol 1:11.3.6. It states the pNHA and other sites in the Minane river valley have indicators of qualifying interests, equal to sites of greater protected status such as SAC European sites/ SPAs /NHAs.</p> <p>Regarding Objective GC-02, the submission requests that this entire stretch of mature deciduous woodland be protected as most of the mature deciduous woodland in the area lies to the north of the village. It states the entire stretch of mature deciduous woodland at Gortigrenane must be protected.</p> <p>It notes that the identification of flood risk areas carries with it an urgency regarding the acceleration, intensity and estimated risk levels of climate change events.</p> <p>Regarding Groundwater Protection it requests that the whole area to the north be protected under a combination of objective DB-02 and GC-02.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<p>1) It states the amenity Walk U-01, encroaches into the identified flood risk area and requests this path be altered to allow for inevitable flooding, to retain the willows and have in addition a green corridor and pollinator meadow, the planting of which be in consultation with Tracton Biodiversity Group. It states the consideration that ‘The development is assessed not to have the potential to give rise to negative or adverse impacts on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites (Vol 1)’ applies in this instance to pNHA site Minane Marsh.</p> <p>2) It states Minane Marsh is a pNHA area and this site comprises the narrow Ringabella estuary incorporating flooded wet fields supporting marsh vegetation and colonising woodland. It notes the site is important for birds, butterflies and other insects and that biodiversity has suffered increasing destruction due to drainage and other groundworks. It notes the most protected species in that area and states it deserves protection and restoration to high ecological status. It states there is considerable risk from flooding already, where the effects of drainage and increased water levels due to rainfall are causing concern for residents of River Valley estate. It requests that mitigation would consist of the protection and restoration of Minane Marsh.</p> <p>3) It states unpurified water is entering Fountainstown beach, a Blue Flag beach. It references Volume 1:11.3.1.</p> <p>4) It notes regarding Minane River, that there are two outfalls from estates and raw sewage from Spruce Grove estate. It recommends that water samples are taken regularly and monitoring for the impact of associated toxins on biodiversity of riverbank, freshwater marsh, saltwater marsh by the dam, and in the SPA below it. It states a Cork Harbour SPA is within the estuary of the Minane River. It notes in Objective U-01 that the proposed path appears to overlap the WWTP reedbed, which is an integral part of the existing WWTP and any interference in the reedbed has potential impact on water quality. It states the waste-water treatment plant for River Valley</p>



	<p>estate is not outlined in the draft plan and requests that this be identified and marked as sensitive infrastructure.</p> <p>5) It notes there is a diversity of geological features and habitats in the area and requests that the Minane River valley be treated with the same consideration as locations on the list of Priority Areas for Action in Vol 1:11.3.6. It states the pNHA and other sites in the Minane river valley have indicators of qualifying interests, equal to sites of greater protected status such as SAC European sites/ SPAs /NHAs.</p> <p>Regarding Objective GC-02, the submission requests that this entire stretch of mature deciduous woodland be protected as most of the mature deciduous woodland in the area lies to the north of the village.</p> <p>6) It notes that the identification of flood risk areas carries with it an urgency regarding the acceleration, intensity and estimated risk levels of climate change events.</p> <p>7) Regarding Groundwater Protection it requests that the whole area to the north be protected under a combination of objective DB-02 and GC-02.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1)It is proposed to amend the route of U-01 to avoid the pNHA. Amendment required regarding the wording to Objective U-01 in Minane Bridge in Table 4.1.26.</p> <p>2)Additional wording is proposed as an amendment Minane Marsh pNHA in Table 4.1.26.</p> <p>3)Noted. This is an operational issue and beyond the remit of the plan.</p> <p>4)Noted. This is an operational issue and is beyond the remit of the plan. U-01 is proposed to be amended to avoid the SPA.</p> <p>5) The areas of woodland and other habitats of biodiversity value referenced lie outside the settlement boundary of the village. Objective BE 15-2 (a) is intended to provide protection to protected sites and sites proposed for protection (including Minane Bridge pNHA) and Objective BE 15-2 (c) is intended to provide protection to habitats of high natural value outside protected sites.</p> <p>6) Noted. Section 11.1 Flooding in Chapter 11 Water Management addresses this issue. The Councils policy on applying the Flood Guidelines are also be set out in this chapter.</p> <p>7) Noted. Section 11.1 Flooding in Chapter 11 Water Management addresses this issue. The Councils policy on applying the Flood Guidelines are also be set out in this chapter.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See amendment 4.1.10.1.</li> <li>2. See amendment 4.1.10.2.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> <li>5. No amendment required.</li> <li>6. No amendment required.</li> <li>7. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Hoddersfield Farm</b>
<b>DCDP345076915</b>	DCDP345076915
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to the walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02, of which cross the submitters farmland, in Volume Four, settlement of 'Crosshaven and Bays'. The submission strongly objects to these walkways and states they were not consulted prior to seeing the maps online. It states it has

	<p>prompted a surge of people walking through the farmland, despite signage outlining it was private property with no rights of way, and states they have been threatened when asking members of the public to vacate their land. It states if these proposed walkways were developed it would lead to a huge increase of people walking off the proposed route and going all over the farm.</p> <p>The submission reference anti-social behaviour at the top of the Glen on one of the proposed routes. It references teenagers starting fires on other farmland and polluting the surrounding area, stating it is a huge risk to livestock and machinery. It rejects the proposed walkways as it states they will funnel further antisocial behaviour towards this area and could potentially harm livestock, destroy crops and woodlands.</p> <p>It states the proposed route passes through private commercial woodland, where activities such as felling, thinning and replanting occur as part of a sustainable management plan of these woodlands. The submission rejects the idea of having a proposed walking route being developed through these woodlands as it would severely compromise the safety of being able to fell and manage the forestry and also puts the public in huge danger along the route.</p> <p>It states parts of the farm are devoted to Biodiversity. It states the proposed route of CS-U-01/CS-U-02 crosses through many of these areas. It notes there are many rare, some protected and endangered species of animals and birds nesting in hedgerows and trees among this area. It refers to the risks of losing habitats, particularly regarding badgers sets, and the risk to the farms, such as a potential TB outbreak.</p> <p>It states the proposed walking routes in the area poses a huge bio-security risk to farmers in the area as people walking from one farm to another could potentially spread diseases and infections on their clothing and footwear from one herd/farm to another. The submission lists the various diseases which could be spread. It notes people walking with dogs pose a huge risk to livestock, not only due to dogs chasing livestock but also due to the fact the dog excrement can contain the parasite Neospora which is dangerous to livestock.</p> <p>It emphasises that farms are very dangerous areas with heavy machinery and dangerous livestock. It states the proposed walking routes cross and border laneways and fields where heavy machinery and dangerous livestock graze. It notes farmers and landowners try to maintain a high level of farm safety but as these proposed walkways travel along farm laneways and across fields this will be hugely comprised and could lead to an accident. It outlines the potential difficulties of the walkways cutting through the farms.</p> <p>The submission requests an official response from Cork County Council on this matter and would like to have a formal written apology.</p>
--	---

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issues raised regarding the walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 which dissect farmland. This submissions outlines reasons as to why these zonings should be amended.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes. See objective CS-GO-06, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ireneusl Ksiazek</b>
<b>DCDP345910992</b>	DCDP345910992
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ita Kirwin</b>
<b>DCDP346132178</b>	DCDP346132178
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the

	parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jackie o brien</b>
<b>DCDP344950588</b>	DCDP344950588
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the walks from the draft county plan be included in the new county development plan to maintain their existence and would like for them to be opened up for public use in the future. It notes it would be sad to see historical walkways through the natural flora and fauna of the local area be removed from the new plan and further notes that this would be removing the very few access routes for the youth in the future to their only rural educational and historical connection to the countryside.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the walks from the draft county plan be included in the new county development plan to maintain their existence and would like for them to be opened up for public use in the future.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long-established walkways and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. See objective CS-GO-06, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jamie O'Toole</b>
<b>DCDP346077423</b>	DCDP346077423

<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jane McGrath</b>
<b>DCDP345606943</b>	DCDP345606943
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as

	Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jen Power</b>
<b>DCDP346134776</b>	DCDP346134776
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jessica Bergkvist</b>
<b>DCDP345289678</b>	DCDP345289678
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable

	walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Nugent</b>
<b>DCDP333396692</b>	DCDP333396692
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission agrees with the greenbelt designation in the area remaining and that the infrastructure on the Coast Road and the surrounding area are congested and that summer traffic congestion prevents vital services getting to their destination in the case of emergencies. The submission requested the following: (1) A stop and go system for Poll Gorm in the summer. (2) Double yellow lines to be painted on the road and for them to be policed after they are done.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Raises issues regarding Municipal District issues at a local level.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. The issues raised are beyond the remit of the plan. There are currently no plans to provide the requested.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Saunders</b>
<b>DCDP346180985</b>	DCDP346180985
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission regards lands situated in in Shannonpark, Carrigaline which are spread over two parcels and three separate folios. It notes in the draft County Development plan the southern parcel are identified as a 'Park and Ride' while the northern portion of lands are outside the development boundary but at an intersection of a number of important road/transport objectives.  This submission requests that a Special X-01 zoning objective be introduced for the north-western part of the town which would facilitate the preparation of a framework master plan to ensure that the lands to the northwest of Carrigaline are developed for a mix of uses in a coherent and integrated manner to compliment the very significant infrastructural investment identified for this part of the town.  It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the County Development Plan 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline



	<p>Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2022-28 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP).</p> <p>It states the level of strategic infrastructure planned for the area is very significant, but the proposed land uses in the area lacks the coherency of the north-eastern/Fernhill part of the town which will have the benefit of a framework masterplan. It outlines reasons as to why a framework masterplan would benefit the town, such as it would optimise the very significant infrastructural investment earmarked for this part of the town.</p> <p>The submission requests that a special objective be added to in Volume 4 of the draft as follows: X-01: The preparation of a master plan to ensure that the lands to the northwest of the town are developed in a coherent and integrated manner to ensure good connectivity both externally with Metropolitan Cork and the rest of Carrigaline and internally between the different land use zones. The framework masterplan will provide a mix of residential and employment uses commensurate with the very infrastructural investment in this part of the town.</p> <p>It states a significant portion of these Tier 1 zoned lands (32%) refer to the Shannonpark masterplan area where housing will be delivered in the short-medium term, which reflects the significant infrastructural improvements planned for this area.</p> <p>It notes the Draft CDP identifies new lands for employment uses to the northeast of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02) and envisages these lands will accommodate significant levels of employment, and states this part of the settlement has also been identified for the preparation of a framework masterplan.</p> <p>It states given the very significant infrastructure proposed on the north-western side of the town it is submitted that a masterplan for this area could take advantage of the significant infrastructure planned for the area with the provision of a mix of residential and employment uses within the overall masterplan area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests that a Special X-01 zoning objective be introduced for the north-western part of the town which would facilitate the preparation of a framework master plan to ensure that the lands to the northwest of Carrigaline are developed for a mix of uses in a coherent and integrated manner to compliment the very significant infrastructural investment identified for this part of the town, and included wording for an zoning objective.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4.</p> <p>As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. The plan has</p>

	already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jolanta Geslak</b>
<b>DCDP345928035</b>	DCDP345928035
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joy McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP346026702</b>	DCDP346026702
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable

	walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Justyna Ksiazek</b>
<b>DCDP345909947</b>	DCDP345909947
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Karen</b>
<b>DCDP346208664</b>	DCDP346208664
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states the submitter grew up near Fernhill so knows the area well and states they are delighted to see that there will be a Technology Campus in Carrigaline, as it will be great for the surrounding area and great for jobs and housing.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Karen Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345248332</b>	DCDP345248332
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission offers thanks for including the community pathways in the plan, as these are invaluable and need to be kept and improved upon, as they provide safe pedestrian access and are one of the unique features of Crosshaven.</p> <p>It requests to preserve greenways as they enhance the overall quality of life of the people living in the area.</p> <p>It states an area of forest was lost to a housing estate which was a travesty. It requests that Cork County Council help preserve natural habitats for the good of the community and the enjoyment of everyone.</p> <p>It requests additional picnicing areas in the plan, which would encourage families and day trippers to visit, especially in the areas where people can appreciate the views without having to access the beach, which would benefit the elderly or infirm, or anyone who is not fond of sand.</p> <p>It requests that there be no more large housing developments as Crosshaven is unsuitable due to the lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>It states there is a strong smell of raw effluent in the Bays area on certain days, as raw sewage is flowing down the hill, straight to the sea along with washing detergent from washing machines and dishwashers.</p> <p>It states traffic congestion is increasing and greater consideration needs to be given to these areas before anymore development should take place.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission offers thanks for including the community pathways in the plan, as these are invaluable and need to be kept and improved upon, as they provide safe pedestrian access and are one of the unique features of Crosshaven.</li> <li>2. It requests to preserve greenways as they enhance the overall quality of life of the people living in the area.</li> <li>3. It states an area of forest was lost to a housing estate which was a travesty. It requests that Cork County Council help preserve natural habitats for the good of the community and the enjoyment of everyone.</li> <li>4. It requests additional picnicing areas in the plan, which would encourage families and day trippers to visit, especially in the areas where people can appreciate the views without having to access the beach, which would benefit the elderly or infirm, or anyone who is not fond of sand.</li> <li>5. It requests that there be no more large housing developments as Crosshaven is unsuitable due to the lack of infrastructure.</li> </ol> <p>It states there is a strong smell of raw effluent in the Bays area on certain days, as raw sewage is flowing down the hill, straight to the</p>

	<p>sea along with washing detergent from washing machines and dishwashers.</p> <p>6. It states traffic congestion is increasing and greater consideration needs to be given to these areas before anymore development should take place.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The plan supports the provision of walkways and green infrastructure and recognises the benefit these amenities provide for the community and the environment.</li> <li>2. Noted. As above.</li> <li>3. Noted. CS-GR-11 Protect woodland area for passive open space use, aims to protect these woodlands from further development.</li> <li>4. See paragraph 1.6.30 which states that a car park and picnic area are to be provided on Templebreedy Fort.</li> <li>5. CS-GO-07 address this issue. The council is supportive of the objective to seek an extension of the Crosshaven public sewer network to serve the Graball area. Any new development should be accompanied by surface water attenuation solutions on site.</li> <li>6. Noted. This is addressed in the Section Movement in Volume 4, Chapter 1 Carrigaline Municipal District, Crosshaven and Bays.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Karina Zaczek</b>
<b>DCDP345912698</b>	DCDP345912698
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Katarzyna Smagiel</b>
<b>DCDP345908426</b>	DCDP345908426
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Katarzyna Wyczynka</b>
<b>DCDP345923455</b>	DCDP345923455
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ken Wynman</b>
<b>DCDP345532407</b>	DCDP345532407
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin Cooney</b>
<b>DCDP346261663</b>	DCDP346261663
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards a site located at Ballyhemiken and makes several planning arguments requesting that the subject lands be included in the zoning Residential Reserve in Fernhill Urban Expansion Area or included the Shannonpark Urban Expansion Area. It states the site is able to accommodate some of the projected growth for Carrigaline and should be included within the development boundary of Carrigaline. Maps and images were included to illustrate the site.</p> <p>The submission requests to insert an objective into Volume 1 of the plan that would state that on certain sites that directly adjoin the development boundary of a settlement, where development has occurred, development</p>



	<p>proposals on lands adjacent to existing development boundaries be considered on a case by case basis provided that it does not contravene any of the other objectives of the development plan and subject to all other considerations.</p> <p>The submission gives a detailed site context, outlining that the site is 6.7ha within close proximity to Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy, and outlines an argument as to why the subject lands should be included in the development boundary to be used for residential development. It states evidence has been provided that substantiates the view that more proactive measures are needed in order to meet the population and housing targets and employment targets.</p> <p>The submission provides background information regarding the area profile and provides current context. The submission references high level planning documentation, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES), Cork County Development Plan 2014 (CDP) and the Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP).</p> <p>It states the site has water supply and waste water capacity and can provide medium term development if the site is zoned. It notes it is logical that lands to the south of the M28 be developed, and states the exclusion of these lands appeared to look like a mapping error without rationale.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests lands be zoned for residential use and be included in the development boundary of the Residential Reserve in Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.</li> <li>2. Requests to insert an objective into Volume 1 of the plan that would state that on certain sites that directly adjoin the development boundary of a settlement, where development has occurred, development proposals on lands adjacent to existing development boundaries be considered on a case by case basis provided that it does not contravene any of the other objectives of the development plan and subject to all other considerations.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. The site is directly adjacent to the M28 route and could have the potential to impinge on its delivery. The noise pollution once the M28 is constructed from the subject site would be a potential issue.</li> <li>2. RP 5-12: Purpose of Greenbelt, ZU 18-3: Development Boundaries, ZU 18-4: Land Use Zoning of Other Lands address this issue. The proposals for extending the development boundary to include adjoining lands is assessed on a case by case basis by the Planning Authority when reviewing the Development Plan. Generally, the development boundary is not extended unless is necessary to meet expected growth targets and does not contravene other objectives in the development plan or contravene the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. It is of the Planning</li> </ol>

	Authorities discretion to include adjoining land within the development boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin O'Connor</b>
<b>DCDP346226897</b>	DCDP346226897
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin O'Driscoll</b>
<b>DCDP346130787</b>	DCDP346130787
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable

	walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin O'Leary</b>
<b>DCDP345530207</b>	DCDP345530207
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kieran Higgins</b>
<b>DCDP346086370</b>	DCDP346086370
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the

	parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lia Harrington</b>
<b>DCDP346191623</b>	DCDP346191623
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states the Fernhill Expansion Area Plan will be great for employment and high-end jobs, and that it will enhance Carrigaline and the surrounding areas. It states this is badly needed in the area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Liam Cronin</b>
<b>DCDP356613531</b>	DCDP356613531
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission regards land in Myrtleville. The subject lands are located just outside the Crosshaven and Bays settlement boundary, which includes Myrtleville and surrounding residential areas. It states the purpose of the submission is to request that the lands associated with a specific property be included within the settlement boundary. It states the site of approximately 0.64 hectares is located just to the north of the Coast Road and existing residential properties at Myrtleville. It notes the centre of Myrtleville, and the beach are located just to the north of the subject lands. A planning policy context was given, outlining policy from the Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 and the Draft County

	Development Plan, referencing objectives such as ZU 18-9: Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. It notes the development boundary offers some various options for limited housing expansion. The submission states the extent of the development boundary adjacent to the specific property does not reflect the extent of existing residential development in the area and should be moved north to match the established northern building line at this location and include the specified lands.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request that the lands associated with a specific property be included within the settlement boundary.</li> <li>2. It notes the development boundary offers some various options for limited housing expansion.</li> <li>3. It states the extent of the development boundary adjacent to the specific property does not reflect the extent of existing residential development in the area and should be moved north to match the established northern building line at this location and include the specified lands.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. Noted. The settlement development boundary is tightly developed in Crosshaven and Bays. There are opportunities for infill development, which is supported within the plan. New dwelling house design and scale needs to be respectful of the character and pattern of existing dwellings while fitting appropriately into the elevated setting of this coastal area of high value landscape overlooking Cork Harbour in the Bays.</li> <li>3. The development boundary is not being extended to include the subject lands, as additional lands for residential use are not required within the lifetime of the plan in Crosshaven and Bays.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Liam O'Toole</b>
<b>DCDP346074932</b>	DCDP346074932
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be

	well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lilija Janovica</b>
<b>DCDP346238719</b>	DCDP346238719
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards a property located at Forest Road, Kilmoney, Carrigaline, Co. Cork. The submission requests that the property which includes a small derelict dwelling house, which is within the A1 Green Belt at present, becomes part of the Carrigaline Town Development Area. It outlines the followings reasons as to why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site is adjoining existing zoned lands to the south.</li> <li>2. It is within a 50km Speed zone,</li> <li>3. It states remains of the existing dwellinghouse still exists,</li> <li>4. It states it has existing water connection with Irish water,</li> <li>5. It notes an existing foul sewer is within 20m of the property,</li> <li>6. It notes it is approximately within 25metres of the Carrigaline Town Development area.</li> </ol> <p>The submission includes the Folio File Plan and maps which illustrates the property, a housing estate and zoned lands to the south along with Carrigaline Development Boundary, public utilities and the 50km speed zone.</p> <p>It states permission is currently being sought from Cork County Council to retain and complete the existing derelict dwellinghouse on the property. It states due to the fact that it is within the A1 Green Belt zone it may prevent it from getting approval.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the property which includes a small derelict dwelling house, which is within the A1 Green Belt at present, becomes part of the Carrigaline Town Development Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</p> <p>In the case of planning permission being granted, based on its existing zoning , prior to the implementation of the new Cork County Development</p>

	Plan, the grant of permission will not be affected by any change to the zoning of the site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lisa Duggan &amp; Paul Simpson</b>
<b>DCDP345937508</b>	DCDP345937508
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks to extend the development boundary of Fountainstown to include lands which already have planning permission and have already been developed for three residential units. Images and maps were included to illustrate the site and location.</p> <p>It states the subject site comprises of three dwellings which are served by a single entrance. It notes the site is bound by agricultural lands, residential dwellings, Ferry Road, and Fountainstown Beach Mobile Home Park. The subject lands are located immediately adjacent to south-west development boundary of Crosshaven and Bays. It notes the existing access off Ferry Road is included within the development boundary.</p> <p>A site history was listed within the submission. It outlines Crosshaven and Bays role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), County Development Plan 2014, Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>The submission lists the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lands are in single ownership,</li> <li>• They have already been developed for individual residential development,</li> <li>• They are constraint free in terms of built and natural heritage, including flood risk,</li> <li>• Their inclusion in the development boundary will consolidate the existing built up footprint of Fountainstown,</li> <li>• Their inclusion in the development boundary of Fountainstown will not compromise the sensitive coastal location, given that they have already been developed,</li> <li>• The access road serving the existing, established three dwellings is already part included within the development boundary,</li> <li>• The existing Local Area Plans and the draft Plan effectively split the lands which is contrary to the Principals of proper planning,</li> <li>• They will contribute to the achievement of compact urban growth in line with national planning policy,</li> <li>• Their inclusion will contribute to the strengthening of Fountainstown and support the strategic importance of Crosshaven and Bays as a Key Village within the County,</li> <li>• They will contribute to the sustainability of existing and proposed social and community facilities in Fountainstown.</li> </ul> <p>It states the inclusion of all the lands within the development boundary for Fountainstown will only require a minor extension to the existing development boundary.</p>



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests to extend the development boundary of Fountainstown to include lands which already have planning permission and have already been developed for three residential units.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The development boundary of Fountainstown in Crosshaven and Bays will be extended to incorporate adjacent existing dwellings within the settlement boundary and zone them within Existing Residential, Mixed Residential and Other Uses. Their inclusion into the settlement development boundary will reflect the extent of existing residential development in the area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See Amendment 4.1.6.1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Louise O'Dea</b>
<b>DCDP345541371</b>	DCDP345541371
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lyndon &amp; Sinead Smith</b>
<b>DCDP344495428</b>	DCDP344495428
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission relates to lands at Ballynametagh, Carrigaline and requests their inclusion within the development boundary of Carrigaline as a new urban expansion area for the town for future residential and employment uses. Details of the planning history of the lands and the strategic role of Carrigaline as set out in national (NPF), Regional (RSES and MASP) and local (current CDP) planning policy are outlined, referencing specific objectives.

	Notes the population and employment uplift envisaged in national and regional policy, the timeframe of the next Plan from 2028-2034 and the low resident worker to job ratio in Carrigaline. Highlights that the lands are in single ownership, available for development, constraint free in terms of heritage and flooding, served by public mains, contiguous to the N28, will contribute to future population, housing and jobs targets, accessible from the Strategic Employment location of Ringaskiddy, will benefit from proposals in the Draft TREP and future infrastructure for sustainable transportation modes and can contribute to the sustainability of existing educational, recreational and social facilities.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests the inclusion of the subject site within the development boundary of Carrigaline as a new urban expansion area for the town for future residential and employment uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. The Fernhill Urban Expansion Area has the provision to meet the future employment needs of Carrigaline, thus the development boundary will not be altered as a result of this submission. The plan has already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality. Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4. .
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>M. Cheers</b>
<b>DCDP345821908</b>	DCDP345821908
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission supports the proposed network of amenity paths in the Crosshaven and Bays area. It highlights that permitted, free, access to the natural environment is a hallmark of a progressive egalitarian society with societal benefits in terms of health and wellbeing of the individuals and communities, as well as the economic opportunities for the rural communities close by. The submission included a map of Crosshaven and Bays taken from the Draft Cork County Development Plan.</p> <p>The submission references the Nordic model of the "right to roam", and the access to the natural environment becoming a human need. It states Ireland is well positioned to serve this need as most of the population live relatively close to high value rural landscapes. It notes that changes in recreational habits, which have accelerated during the current pandemic crisis, have increased the demand for quality outdoor access, particularly at rural locations close to where people live.</p> <p>The submission discusses paths and bridleways and states the Draft Cork County Development Plan shows these routes clearly and has identified them as part of the Specific Development Objectives, as future amenity walks. The submission states land access disputes have highlighted that</p>

	<p>public access to paths and bridleways, even those in current use, are not protected by law. It states landowners, often fearful of punitive legal liabilities, often close existing pathways, and results in the overuse of what remains and simmering local resentments.</p> <p>The submission states the proposed network around Crosshaven, if re-established, would allow users to benefit from safe segregation from vehicle traffic throughout the Crosshaven peninsular and would be a unique amenity for local residents and visitors in the region that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide significant visitor amenity</li> <li>• a green commuting alternative for locals</li> <li>• safe pedestrian access in rural areas that otherwise lack it</li> <li>• improve the health and well-being of the people who use them</li> <li>• enable people to participate in, and enjoy the rural environment</li> <li>• bring economic benefits to the area</li> <li>• recover a tangible benefit from landholdings that are, in some circumstances, in receipt of significant funding from the tax payer</li> <li>• recover access to public rights of way that have since been blocked or challenged by landowners</li> </ul> <p>The submission makes reference to CS-U-01 and CS-U-02, stating these paths would give the community of Myrtleville and Hoddersfield safer pedestrian access to Crosshaven.</p> <p>It states by connecting with the Crosshaven Railway amenity walk beside the Owenabue River, the strength of the local path network would be also augmented for visitors, allowing more circuit walking routes, potentially via the visitor attractions of Camden Fort, Crosshaven House, the village and the beaches at Myrtleville and Fountainstown.</p> <p>It states the protection and/or re-opening of rights of way on historic paths represent an opportunity to establish a game changing initiative that would provide visitor amenity, a safe, green commuting alternative for locals, and an enhancement of the local environment at low cost. It notes the key to the success of re-establishment of these paths will be to resolve the concerns that landowners have regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• legal liability for the injuries sustained by people while crossing their lands</li> <li>• path management and maintenance,</li> <li>• protection of privacy and right to enjoyment of private outdoor space associated with residential properties.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission states land access disputes have highlighted that public access to paths and bridleways, even those in current use, are not protected by law.</li> <li>2. The submission states the proposed network around Crosshaven, if re-established, would allow users to benefit from safe segregation from vehicle traffic throughout the Crosshaven peninsular and</li> </ol>

	<p>would be a unique amenity for local residents and visitors in the region.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The submission makes reference to CS-U-01 and CS-U-02, stating these paths would give the community of Myrtleville and Hoddersfield safer pedestrian access to Crosshaven.</li> <li>4. It states by connecting with the Crosshaven Railway amenity walk beside the Owenabue River, the strength of the local path network would be also augmented for visitors, allowing more circuit walking routes, potentially via the visitor attractions of Camden Fort, Crosshaven House, the village and the beaches at Myrtleville and Fountainstown.</li> <li>5. It states the protection and/or re-opening of rights of way on historic paths represent an opportunity to establish a game changing initiative that would provide visitor amenity, a safe, green commuting alternative for locals, and an enhancement of the local environment at low cost.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</li> <li>2. Noted. See objective CS-GO-06, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes.</li> <li>3. The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes.</li> <li>4. Noted. The plan supports the provision of walkways in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities.</li> <li>5. Noted. As above.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Marcin Baranowska</b>
<b>DCDP345904970</b>	DCDP345904970
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable</p>

	walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Margaret Lucey</b>
<b>DCDP345551978</b>	DCDP345551978
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Objects to provision of a walkway, subject of objective CS-U-02 in Crosshaven, noting these lands are a working dairy farm and the walkway would bisect the lands and run through the farmyard. States there has already been experience of anti-social behaviour and dumping of rubbish near the entrance to the property and questions how a plan was prepared which shows no appreciation of the nature of the farming enterprise here and the potential danger to any member of the public using a walkway along this route. A Folio map and engineering report echoing the difficulties and health and safety concerns with a walkway bisecting a working dairy farm is also submitted.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Issue raised regarding the CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 walkways which dissect farmlands in Crosshaven and Bays.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes. See objective CS-GO-06 in Table 4.1.19, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Margaret Mahony</b>
<b>DCDP346114253</b>	DCDP346114253
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests that 47 acres of parkland to the west of Novartis manufacturing site in Ringaskiddy be designated as Green Infrastructure. Notes that this developed parkland is not an infrastructure asset and its maintenance is an intrinsic part of the overall planning permission for the Novartis complex under Ref. S/2989/89. The retention of the 47 acres free from development and the landscaping of this buffer zone are stated as conditions of the planning permission that was granted as well as a commitment given by Sandoz that the lands would be planted to form a wildlife corridor and for

	<p>use as recreational space by employees.</p> <p>The parkland is an asset to Shanbally, where there is a deficit of passive open space within walking distance of residents and these lands are critical for this purpose.</p> <p>The buffer zone functions as green infrastructure in accordance with the definition of the European Commission and deserves to be zoned as green infrastructure.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Margaret Somers</b>
<b>DCDP346272869</b>	DCDP346272869
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Marie-Anne Cotter</b>
<b>DCDP345463482</b>	DCDP345463482

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p> <p>The submission reviews publicly available documentation, such as the Interim Environmental Statement 2004, and gives details of the extent of the landscaping undertaken by Novartis, which refers to them planting 'a substantial number of native Irish deciduous tree with the goal of recreating a native woodland setting', and states the site incorporates a number of amenity walkways, which are used by both employees and members of the local community '.</p> <p>It notes in the site HSE Policy for Novartis Ringaskiddy Limited 2014 it states 'The health and safety of the employees, neighbours, customers and consumers, and the protection of the environment are company priorities consistently pursued at all levels in the organisation'. It states the sale of this amenity contradicts this statement as any development on this site would destroy the environment and pave the way for industry or residential considerations.</p> <p>It notes a biodiversity study of the area was detailed in a study commissioned by Novartis and conducted by an ecological consultant and outlines that there were six species recorded (Swallow, House Martin, Robin, Goldcrest, Green Finch and linnet) within the Novartis Campus that are now in the amber list. It states in an age of accelerated climate change, deforestation, and destruction of animal habitats it would be concerning that this type of wood land be used for an alternative purpose. The submission enclosed a leaflet from BirdWatch Ireland.</p> <p>It states an entomologist spent two hours assessing the site and noted a number of butterfly species including Holly Blue, Peacock, Speckled Wood and the Comma Butterfly, a recent arrival to Cork.</p> <p>It refers to an online petition that was set up and as of the 22.06.2021 there were 766 online signatures. It states this merits further consideration of this area as a valuable space to Shanbally, and as a green space, given that under the current local plans there is no publicly accessible spaces. It notes areas that appear in the plan are all private lands and in certain circumstance are only accessible via a club membership.</p>
----------------------------------	--



	The submission included four publicly available documents regarding Novartis one document containing 766 signatures.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martha Harte</b>
<b>DCDP345612929</b>	DCDP345612929
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345895823</b>	DCDP345895823
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission relates to lands in Lackaroe and included maps to illustrate the site. It states the site has received full planning permission for two dwellings over the last decade and a current change of house type is

	<p>currently being assessed by the planning authority. It states many of the previous delays in the finalisation of the planning has been due to the issue of a right of way required by the planning authority for a proposed new link road to service the adjoining lands which is now in the process of being rescinded by the council.</p> <p>The submission notes that in the proposed Development Plan that the area is to have its designation returned to agricultural lands. It requests that given the previous grants of permission and the current application that the lands in question remain within the development boundary of Passage West/Glenbrook.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Development Plan that the area is to have its designation returned to agricultural lands. It requests that given the previous grants of permission and the current application that the lands in question remain within the development boundary of Passage West/Glenbrook.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</p> <p>In the case of planning permission being granted, based on its existing zoning , prior to the implementation of the new Cork County Development Plan, the grant of permission will not be affected by any change to the zoning of the site.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Cotter</b>
<b>DCDP345534054</b>	DCDP345534054
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their

	use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Cunningham</b>
<b>DCDP345822776</b>	DCDP345822776
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone . It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p> <p>It states the is a need to meet our commitments to the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2030, Build resilient communities: Protection of valuable and vulnerable ecological assets. It states Climate action, mitigation of risks, biodiversity protection and restoration must be central to every policy in the County Development Plan and the benefits clearly communicated. It states that supporting behaviour change in people and communities and provision of Green Infrastructure locations/amenities is a major component in engagement.</p> <p>The submissions is made in the context of the following national and international declarations and strategies: The EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030, Ireland’s 2019 Declaration of a Climate and Biodiversity Emergency, The 2019 United Nations Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Sustainable Development Goals SDG13 and SDG17, and the Paris Agreement Commitments.</p> <p>The submission requests to make a Special Amenity Area order for the site. It also requests the engagement of the Council with local people and groups to hear their needs, experience, knowledge, and connection to this place. It states for the Council to have the investment of local community support and sentiment, it asks that it acknowledge the needs for green spaces and form a relationship that is open, transparent, and trustworthy with local populations.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity. The submission refers to the Sustainable Development Goals, the Paris Agreement and national and international declarations and strategies.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Cunningham</b>
<b>DCDP345508001</b>	DCDP345508001
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to Minane Bridge and outlines its requests under the following headings:</p> <p>1) New house development: The submission requests to reference an intention to build a community, a sustainable village, to provide units for an increasing aging population, and supported accommodation and availability for all ages to rent in the short-medium term. It states recreational space, a community garden, broadband, safe cycling and walking routes are minimum requirements for additional development.</p> <p>2) Need for accommodation: It notes this could be generated from retrofitting vacant and derelict sites.</p> <p>3) Green Village: It states co-operative, self-build and green village developments should be given mention and support.</p> <p>4) Proposed walk U-01. It states the walkway falls within flood risk Zones A and B, with no future proofing visible or otherwise mentioned. It requests to change the route of the walk for mitigation of increased flood events.</p> <p>5) Minane Marsh: It requests to identify the marsh as a pNHA with protected species and to take measures to protect it from further drainage and destruction by changing the route of proposed walk. It states there is a need to identify other basic aspects of natural heritage, habitats, woodlands, places where people can socialise and meet outdoors.</p> <p>6) Floods Directive: It requests more detail in the plan on nature based mitigation of identified local flood risks and for this to be done in conjunction with local communities to deliver co-benefits.</p> <p>7) Energy: It requests public engagement and participation in identifying local demands and resources with potential to contribute to renewable sources of energy.</p> <p>8) Green Infrastructure: It requests to protect the marsh and river valley from further destruction of biodiversity by drainage, chemicals, clearance.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1) Requests to reference an intention to build a community, a sustainable village, to provide units for an increasing aging population, and supported accommodation and availability for all ages to rent in the short-medium term. It states recreational space, a community garden, broadband, safe cycling and walking routes are minimum requirements for additional development.</p> <p>2) Need for accommodation: It notes this could be generated from retrofitting vacant and derelict sites.</p> <p>3) Green Village: It states co-operative, self-build and green village developments should be given mention and support.</p>

	<p>4) Proposed walk U-01. It states the walkway falls within flood risk Zones A and B, with no future proofing visible or otherwise mentioned. It requests to change the route of the walk for mitigation of increased flood events.</p> <p>5) Minane Marsh: It requests to identify the marsh as a pNHA with protected species and to take measures to protect it from further drainage and destruction by changing the route of proposed walk. It states there is a need to identify other basic aspects of natural heritage, habitats, woodlands, places where people can socialise and meet outdoors.</p> <p>6) Floods Directive: It requests more detail in the plan on nature based mitigation of identified local flood risks and for this to be done in conjunction with local communities to deliver co-benefits.</p> <p>7) Energy: It requests public engagement and participation in identifying local demands and resources with potential to contribute to renewable sources of energy.</p> <p>8) Green Infrastructure: It requests to protect the marsh and river valley from further destruction of biodiversity by drainage, chemicals, clearance.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 2.9 Sustainable Settlement Framework for County Cork in Chapter 2 Core Strategy addresses and Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, and Chapter 4 Housing address this issue.</li> <li>2. Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, Objective PL 3-2: Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places addresses this issue. The plan encourages the development of infill housing on suitable sites, subject to adherence to residential amenity standards and avoiding any undue impacts on the established character of an area.</li> <li>3. Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, Section 3.5 Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places and Objective PL 3-2: Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places addresses this issue. The plan encourages the development of infill housing on suitable sites, subject to adherence to residential amenity standards and avoiding any undue impacts on the established character of an area.</li> <li>4. The indicative line of U-01 will be amended to avoid the Minane Bridge Marsh pNHA.</li> <li>5. An additional objective will be included within the plan in Table 4.1.26 stating new development should be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection of this wetland and will only be permitted where it is shown that it is compatible with the requirements of with environmental, biodiversity and landscape protection policies as set out in Volume One Main Policy Material and Volume Two Heritage and Amenity.</li> <li>6. Noted. Section 11.1 Flooding in Chapter 11 Water Management addresses this issue. The Councils policy on applying the Flood Guidelines are also be set out in this chapter.</li> <li>7. Noted. Objective SC 6-2 states the Planning Authority will continue to actively engage with all citizens in order to encourage involvement in their community and promote cohesive planning so people have a voice in the decisions that affect their quality of life in their county, where appropriate.</li> <li>8. Noted. An additional objective will be included within the plan stating new development should be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection of this wetland and will only</li> </ol>

	be permitted where it is shown that it is compatible with the requirements of with environmental, biodiversity and landscape protection policies as set out in Volume One Main Policy Material and Volume Two Heritage and Amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. See amendment 4.1.10.2.</li> <li>5 and 8: See amendment 4.1.10.1.</li> <li>6 No amendment required.</li> <li>7 No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Hayes</b>
<b>DCDP345938443</b>	DCDP345938443
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands at Hayes Lane in Monkstown. It states the purpose of this submission is to seek the consolidation of Monkstown, by an extension to the development boundary and the rezoning of lands of 2.02ha to Medium C low density residential to facilitate approximately 10 detached family homes on individual sites, as an alternative to one-off housing in the Metropolitan Greenbelt in the vicinity of Monkstown which is under pressure for urban generated housing.</p> <p>It states it is predicated on the need expressed at national, regional and local level to facilitate compact growth within and contiguous to the built up areas of existing settlements across the country, and regards the pattern of development in the vicinity; the availability of Irish Water services; the availability of sustainable transportation modes; and the availability of existing recreational, leisure and educational resources.</p> <p>It outlines Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2022. Maps and images were included to illustrate the site and location.</p> <p>The submission outlines the following requests and observations in line with national, regional and local planning policy as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It notes it is clear that Monkstown is identified in the draft Plan as a settlement that should be prioritised to accommodate additional development.</li> <li>• It states it is a location of choice for residential development, having regard to its physical, environmental and social attributes, and proximity to Ringaskiddy and Cork City.</li> <li>• It states the Metropolitan Greenbelt in the vicinity of Monkstown is under pressure for urban-generated rural housing, thus an extension to the development boundary and the rezoning of the subject lands to Medium C low density residential will facilitate a very attractive alternative to one-off housing. It notes the extension of the development boundary will facilitate additional residential development to meet the projected population increase for the town.</li> <li>• It highlights that this additional residential development will contribute to the sustainability of existing infrastructure, and will support the case for</li> </ul>

	<p>enhanced connections, such as the Greenway to Carrigaline. It notes it will also support the case for further investment in local services in Monkstown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It references the town and sites access to water facilities. It states the subject lands can connect to Irish Water services in the public road to the south.</li> <li>• It states additional residential development will ensure the sustainability of existing recreational infrastructure, in particular the marina.</li> <li>• It requests a modest extension of the development boundary to incorporate the lands which are contiguous to the existing development boundary, stating it is logical. It states it will ensure there is a distinct separation between the settlement of Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown and Rafeen and Douglas.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests the consolidation of Monkstown, by an extension to the development boundary and the rezoning of lands of 2.02ha to Medium C low density residential to facilitate approximately 10 detached family homes on individual sites, as an alternative to one-off housing in the Metropolitan Greenbelt in the vicinity of Monkstown which is under pressure for urban generated housing. The submissions outlines reasons as to why this site is appropriate to be included within the development boundary of Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>No amendment required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Mary O'Leary Cork Harbour Alliance for a Safe environment (CHASE)</b></p>
<b>DCDP344301407</b>	<p>DCDP344301407</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission supports the zoning of the eastern quadrant of RY-I-15 from industry to education and states this area must be ring fenced for marine related education, innovation in green energy enterprise, research and development. It states the Beaufort Institute is one of the most innovative in marine energy and it is vital to identify and protect available lands for future development in these areas of Research and Development and this should be the focus of this County Development Plan.</p> <p>It notes the foot-fall in the Ringaskiddy area in the last 15 months, and that the development of the park on Paddy's point and Haulbowline and the walk to Martello Tower are amenities that need the full protection of Cork County Council.</p> <p>The submission references the applications for the incinerator in the area. The submission requests that Cork County Council buy the site of RY-I-15 by C.P.O. to ensure that this area is protected and realises its full potential as envisioned by C.A.S.P. for education, leisure and tourism.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. States the eastern quadrant of RY-I-15 from industry to education and states this area must be ring fenced for marine related education, innovation in green energy enterprise, research and development.</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Notes it is vital to identify and protect available lands for future development in these areas of Research and Development and this should be the focus of this County Development Plan.</li> <li>3. Notes Paddy's point and Haulbowline and the walk to Martello Tower are amenities that need the full protection of Cork County Council.</li> <li>4. Requests that Cork County Council buy the site of RY-I-15 by C.P.O. to ensure that this area is protected and realises its full potential as envisioned by C.A.S.P. for education, leisure and tourism.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. RY-I-09 is suitable for the extension of the Third Level Educational campus and enterprise related development including marine related education, enterprise, research and development.</li> <li>2. Both RY-I-19 and RY-I-09 have provision for Third Level Educational facilities and enterprise related development including marine related education, enterprise, research and development.</li> <li>3. These sites appear in the Green Infrastructure Map, Figure 4.1.7. Martello Tower is also protected under Objective RY-GR-10 in the plan.</li> <li>4. Noted. This issue is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary O'Leary/ Cork Harbour Alliance for a Safe Environment</b>
<b>DCDP344296067</b>	DCDP344296067
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regarded a 47 acre woodland area which acts as a buffer between Novartis and housing and serves as an amenity for the people in the area. It requests it be kept as an amenity regardless of future plans by Novartis. The submission suggests this land be purchased by CPO by Cork County Council for the benefit of the community which is one of the only green areas left in Ringaskiddy/Shanbally. It notes the value of green spaces for recreational use and physical and mental well-being, which was particularly evident in times of Covid.</p> <p>It refers to the Novartis permission which allowed Novartis to take in and burn waste from other companies and sources. It references the applications for a commercial incinerator in Cork Harbour and states that opposition will apply to any effort to include any commercial incinerator. It requested to protect this amenity.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Maura Higgins O'Driscoll</b>

<b>DCDP346123125</b>	DCDP346123125
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Cahill</b>
<b>DCDP346076246</b>	DCDP346076246
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Plichta</b>
<b>DCDP345929734</b>	DCDP345929734
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose. The submission then describes how to make a submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michelle Walsh</b>
<b>DCDP346207237</b>	DCDP346207237
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states it is good to see the Fernhill Expansion plan which will provide more employment, especially after the year just had with so many people losing their jobs. The submission states this will be great for Carrigaline and the surrounding areas as there is also a serious need for housing in Carrigaline.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to

	ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>MLambkin</b>
<b>DCDP346248410</b>	DCDP346248410
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission states Objective CL-U-07 should be omitted from plan. It states Mountain Road should form part of a proper pedestrian and cycling network, as per TPREP. It notes the upgrade of Mountain Road as per the plan is a priority. It states Mountain Road should be upgraded prior to the development land which is planned for 500 houses, and
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	That the Plan should include an Objective to upgrade the <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests Objective CL-U-07 be omitted from the Plan,</li> <li>2. States Mountain Road to form part of the Primary Pedestrian and Cycle Network as described in the TPREP,</li> <li>3. Requests that access to new development should be from the R611.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CL-U-07 will be maintained to allow future access to CL-R-10 after its upgrade.</li> <li>2. Elements of TPREP will be incorporated in the plan. Amendment required to include elements of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Enhancement Plan into Volume 4, Chapter 1, Carrigaline Municipal District. See Amendment 4.1.3.21.</li> <li>3. Access to the CL-R-10 site is set to be provided from the R611 and Mountain Road, following its proposed upgrade.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Monkstown, Glenbrook, Passage Branch of Cork Harbour Alliance for a safe Environment</b>
<b>DCDP344678595</b>	DCDP344678595
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as

	Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Monkstown, Glenbrook, Passage Branch of Cork Harbour Alliance for a safe Environment</b>
<b>DCDP344666407</b>	DCDP344666407
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states Monkstown is a unique area in both heritage and history and has been classed as an Architectural Conservation Area. It notes in the draft Plan it has been linked with Glenbrook and Passage which have clear differences in their needs.</p> <p>It states Monkstown has water frontage that brings people and cyclists from outside the area to walk the Heart Walk as far as Shanbally, and around the harbour.</p> <p>It states appropriate lighting is needed which distinguishes Monkstown from the industrial area. It states the SAC area near Shanbally needs to be protected from noise and light pollution.</p> <p>It notes the Victorian walls (located near the Cut and Cover below Carrigmahon Villa) need repairing especially when the foundations of the walls have been damaged cleaning the drainage.</p> <p>It highlights that all of Monkstown has a vista of Cork Harbour and is linked with Shanbally, Ringaskiddy, Cobh. It states the deep-water Marina gets no mention in the Draft Plan. It notes the facilities offered to small boats is huge and adds to the amenities of the whole harbour.</p> <p>It states the moving of the Container Port to Ringaskiddy has unbalanced the functioning of amenities that the Harbour offered. It states the Container Port was moved to the wrong side of the river with no rail connectivity. It notes the waterfront of Ringaskiddy can no longer be seen from Monkstown, and the facilities of Gobby Beach and Lough Beg beach are being threatened by Indaver, and Novartis. It states the zoning of the Ringaskiddy area must be looked at to preserve these amenities. The submissions references another submission made regarding the Novartis site.</p> <p>It requests good speed road signage coming into and going out of Monkstown instead of ramps.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It notes in the draft Plan it has been linked with Glenbrook and Passage which have clear differences in their needs.</li> <li>2. It states appropriate lighting is needed which distinguishes Monkstown from the industrial area. It states the SAC area near Shanbally needs to be protected from noise and light pollution.</li> <li>3. It notes the Victorian walls (located near the Cut and Cover below Carrigmahon Villa) need repairing especially when the foundations of the walls have been damaged cleaning the drainage.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. It highlights that all of Monkstown has a vista of Cork Harbour and is linked with Shanbally, Ringaskiddy, Cobh. It states the deep-water Marina gets no mention in the Draft Plan. It notes the facilities offered to small boats is huge and adds to the amenities of the whole harbour.</li> <li>5. It states the moving of the Container Port to Ringaskiddy has unbalanced the functioning of amenities that the Harbour offered. It states the Container Port was moved to the wrong side of the river with no rail connectivity.</li> <li>6. It notes the waterfront of Ringaskiddy can no longer be seen from Monkstown, and the facilities of Gobby Beach and Lough Beg beach are being threatened by Indaver, and Novartis. It states the zoning of the Ringaskiddy area must be looked at to preserve these amenities. The submissions references another submission made regarding the Novartis site.</li> <li>7. It requests good speed road signage coming into and going out of Monkstown instead of ramps.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. Passage West, Glenbrook and Monkstown are all located within the settlement of Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown and are addressed within Section 1.4 in Volume 4.</li> <li>2. Noted. This issue is operational and is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>3. Noted. This issue is operational and is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>4. Noted. This issue is operational and is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>5. Noted. The Container Port was located strategically in Ringaskiddy.</li> <li>6. Noted. The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities.</li> <li>7. Noted. This issue is operational and is beyond the remit of the plan</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Munster Technological University</b>
<b>DCDP345919914</b>	DCDP345919914
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards Munster Technological University (MTU) and provides a detailed context of the campus, facilities and Principals of the University, stating it has a student body more than 18,000, offers a full spectrum of courses from craft apprenticeships and work-based qualifications to PhDs and is committed to the development of a strong and innovative higher education sector which is vital to sustaining and developing community and the economy. It states entrepreneurship is in MTU's DNA and has supported the development of approximately 500 start-up businesses to date.</p> <p>It states the development of County Cork under headings such as transport, research and innovation, economic and community development, entrepreneurship, broadband, maritime and energy are important, and that the draft development plan addresses these points very well. It states there are a number of specific areas in which the draft plan should provide some additional detail, which are set out below:</p>

	<p>1. It requests to retain zoning objective RY-I-19 in the new Cork County Development Plan.</p> <p>It states the National Maritime College of Ireland (NMCI), a constituent College of MTU, UCC and the Irish Naval Service (INS) are committed to supporting marine and maritime research and for Ringaskiddy to be the national focal point for marine and maritime innovation, training and capacity building. It states NMCI, UCC, and INS continue to work together to attract new research and industry partners to Ringaskiddy to realise the benefits of co-location, support established and emerging marine and maritime sectors, and realise the full potential of Ireland’s Blue Economy. It notes NMCI has medium-term plans to expand its training and education facilities to include an additional sea survival and offshore renewable energy training centre and an advanced simulation centre for further education.</p> <p>2. It requests to encourage the development of student and hotel accommodation in the vicinity of the NMCI, to support the increased international promotion of Cork’s maritime education and training offerings, as well as catering for the expansion of activity in Cork’s blue economy.</p> <p>3. It requests in light of the rapid development and deployment of online learning options during the COVID-19 pandemic, to include advanced technology-enhanced learning options in various “co-working” hubs and “digital hubs” / “e-centres” to facilitate increased access to higher education within community settings. It states the maximisation of the provision of technology-enhanced learning options for all relevant areas in County Cork has the potential to reduce loading on transport systems and on student accommodation, and it would be worth performing an in-depth strategic analysis to quantify the benefits to be achieved for the County in this regard.</p> <p>4. It requests to provide specific supports for student entrepreneurship on a county-wide basis, reserving incubation space and partnering with the higher education sector to support this strategic development of an entrepreneurship culture and talent pipeline to drive sustainable regional development and expansion of indigenous industry.</p> <p>5. Regarding the rapid development of “new space” sector and Cork’s strategic positioning to exploit same, it requests support for the development of a “new space” cluster in County Cork to be included in the plan. It states the development of a “new space” cluster in County Cork would confer significant competitive advantages on the region. It states the imminent roll-out of low-earth-orbit satellite broadband can play a key role in supporting the development of “digital hubs / e-centres” in rural and geographically dispersed locations. It states given that the number density of Starlink satellites they will possibly favour the South West, and states this is an opportunity that should not be ignored. It states low-earth-orbit satellites may provide faster connectivity to key global markets than is possible using fiber optic technologies. It states this is a vitally important consideration for development of relevant industry sectors, an additional factor to be considered in the broader context of the development of County Cork.</p>
--	--



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests to retain the zoning RY-I-19 in Ringaskiddy and outlines their intent to develop the site.</li> <li>2. Requests to encourage the development of student and hotel accommodation in the vicinity of the NMCI.</li> <li>3. Requests in light of the rapid development and deployment of online learning options during the COVID-19 pandemic, to include advanced technology-enhanced learning options in various “co-working” hubs and “digital hubs” / “e-centres” to facilitate increased access to higher education within community settings.</li> <li>4. Requests to provide specific supports for student entrepreneurship on a county-wide basis, reserving incubation space and partnering with the higher education sector to support this strategic development of an entrepreneurship culture and talent pipeline to drive sustainable regional development and expansion of indigenous industry.</li> <li>5. Requests support for the development of a “new space” cluster in County Cork to be included in the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective RY-I-19 will be retained with the County Development Plan, and is deemed suitable for the extension of the adjacent Third Level Educational Campus and enterprise related development including marine related education, enterprise, research and development. Consideration will also be given to established operators in Ringaskiddy for the provision of ancillary office accommodation and for Research and Development facilities.</li> <li>2. Paragraph 1.5.22 in Volume 4, Chapter 1 Carrigaline Municipal District, Ringaskiddy, addresses the need for student accommodation in Ringaskiddy. The plan notes any student, staff and short-term visitor accommodation should be catered for within the town centre of Ringaskiddy at an appropriate scale.</li> <li>3. There are 17 Co-Working Hubs identified in Cork County, 15 of which are Enterprise and Co-Working Hubs and 2 of which are Community Hubs. These Hubs are listed in Section 8.11 Remote Working of Chapter 8 Economic Development.</li> <li>4. The plan supports the development of industrial and commercial infrastructure including the provision of E-Centres/Digital Hubs and Incubator Units. They are addressed in Chapter 8 Economic Development.</li> <li>5. Noted. The development of a “new space” cluster would be beneficial to Cork County.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Niall Nicholson</b>
<b>DCDP346495436</b>	DCDP346495436
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Objects to provision of a walkway, subject of objectives CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 in Crosshaven. Expresses disappointment that, as a landowner, there was no consultation with him prior to publication of the route and also notes the surge in people walking through the farm having observed the route on the map in the Plan. Despite the erection of private property signage, members of the public ignore the signs and trespass, subjecting the

	landowner to threats. Notes the occurrence of anti-social behaviour by teens setting fires and breaking glass bottles and the risk this causes to livestock and machinery and believes this proposal will funnel further anti-social behaviour towards this area. The walk passes through commercial forestry and would compromise the safety of felling and managing the forest. Parts of the farm are devoted to biodiversity and a walking route would disturb badgers and could potentially lead to a TB outbreak. The interlinking of walks in the area would pose a bio-security risk and lead to potential infection of cattle from dogs. The routes cross and border lands where heavy machinery and dangerous livestock graze, making farming in the area extremely hard and dangerous. States there is no right of way on this private farm.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission objects to the inclusion of CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 in relation to not being consulted as the landowner of the proposed walkways, trespassing on farmland, the disturbance of local wildlife and biodiversity risk, the walkways dissecting farmlands and forestry which imposes health and safety risks, anti-social behaviour, and the safety of animals and pedestrians.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes. See objective CS-GO-06, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes. See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Niamh Cuffe</b>
<b>DCDP346127118</b>	DCDP346127118
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission supports the zoning of lands at Fernhill, and states it is necessary for future employment of the submitter's family in the area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Based on Carrigaline's strategic location within Metropolitan Cork and historical growth trends it is important to ensure that provision is made for the long-term housing and jobs needs of the town over and above what is provided for in the current residential/employment zonings.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Niamh Morris</b>
<b>DCDP342748042</b>	DCDP342748042
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning

	permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nicola Chambers</b>
<b>DCDP346229447</b>	DCDP346229447
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nicola Clifford</b>
<b>DCDP346078919</b>	DCDP346078919
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning

	<p>permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Nine multi-national and indigenous life sciences companies based in Co. Cork</b></p>
<b>DCDP346040506</b>	<p>DCDP346040506</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission was submitted by a group of nine multi-national and indigenous life sciences companies based in Cork and states the group contributes significantly to the local economy, outlining examples such as stating there is planned future investment in excess of €1billion. The submission states it is appreciated that the draft plan recognises the important role that the life sciences cluster plays in driving employment for the region. It makes observations under the following headings:  M28 Upgrade Project: It states as Cork is expected to be the fastest-growing city region in Ireland under the Project Ireland 2040 Framework, it is incumbent upon Cork County Council to set ambitious targets in the provision of transport infrastructure. It references their previous submission regarding the M28 upgrade project, and states they are pleased that the draft Plan recognises the strategic importance of the project and it being a priority in order to bring certainty of commitment to existing and future investment in the Ringaskiddy and in acknowledging the potential for disruption to strategic land banks in the Ringaskiddy. It welcomes the Council's commitment to engaging with relevant stakeholders in the area and states they will engage with stakeholders and the Council prior to the construction project commencing, so as to ensure disruptions to site operations in Ringaskiddy are minimised where possible. It requests that increased public transport options and schedules during the construction period are considered. It states the Council are intrinsic in ensuring the region remains an attractive destination for FDI. It states in light of the review of the National Development Plan by the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, it is imperative any further iterations of this plan</p>

	<p>continue to strongly support the need for this vital infrastructure project to be completed as soon as possible.</p> <p>Public Transport Infrastructure: It states it welcome the recognition of the Council’s responsibility for protecting the quality of life afforded to the residents of Ringaskiddy and Shanbally. It refers to their previous submission regarding alleviating traffic congestion. It notes the commitment to the development of a public transport facility on the designated Urban Expansion Area (UEA) adjacent to the Shannonpark Roundabout as part of the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS), will represent a significant investment in public transport links between Cork Harbour and the rest of Metropolitan Cork. It states it will support any developments which will be to their neighbours benefit. It supports proposals to upgrade the N28 upon the completion of the M28, and supports proposals which will bring about the delivery of the Cork Harbour Greenway, incorporating this new active travel corridor. It refers to their previous submission regarding concerns about water-based transport, and states it appreciates the section on Water Based Transport in Volume 1 of the draft plan. It welcomes the recognition from the Council that such transport options in Cork Harbour could provide an alternative to private car transport. It acknowledges appreciation for exploring the feasibility of a new public ferry between Cobh and Ringaskiddy during the lifetime of this plan, and echoes the Council’s contention regarding the workforce base in East Cork/Northern Environs of the city, stating a cross-river ferry could prove to be a very efficient means of reducing traffic congestion and commuting times.</p> <p>Corrections: The submission states in Volume 4 of the Draft Plan there are a number of instances of references to incorrect company names which we would like to see corrected and continues to outline them.</p> <p>It states the Draft Plan will play a crucial role in ensuring that the needs of Cork County will be met over the course of the next decade. It states over the lifetime of this plan key infrastructure must be delivered to schedule, in order to ensure that Cork remains on track to achieve its potential under Project Ireland 2040. It notes in the aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic, it is imperative that Cork County Council uses this plan to make a compelling case for development, so as to ensure that Government policies and funding continue to support societal and economic growth in the region. It commends Cork County Council for the work that has gone into preparing this draft Plan, and notes there exists a desire to maintain Cork’s competitive position, and set in motion a resolute strategy which will harness the potential of Cork County in the coming decades. It states it looks forward to continued productive collaboration with the Council to ensure that the Ringaskiddy area can continue to act as a key driver in the success of the region.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<p>1. Issue regarding the M28. It requests that increased public transport options and schedules during the construction period are considered. It states the Council are intrinsic in ensuring the region remains an attractive destination for FDI. It states in light of the review of the National Development Plan by the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, it is imperative any further</p>

	<p>iterations of this plan continue to strongly support the need for this vital infrastructure project to be completed as soon as possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Welcomes changes regarding Public Transport Infrastructure in the Draft Plan.</li> <li>3. Outlines errors in company names.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Volume 4 Carrigaline Municipal District, Objective CL-GO-04Traffic and Transportation supports the timely delivery of the M28 motorway by safeguarding the route corridor from inappropriate development.</li> <li>2. Noted. The support of the Draft Plan is welcomed.</li> <li>3. The plan will include the correct company names as set out in this submission within Volume 4, Chapter 1, Carrigaline Municipal District.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. See amendment 4.1.5.3.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Noel &amp; Marianne O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345930308</b>	DCDP345930308
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission contains two letters. The submissions requested that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. They referenced the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. They stated that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. They noted there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Norma Collins</b>
<b>DCDP346125340</b>	DCDP346125340

<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose. The submission then describes how to make a submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Brien and O'Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP345667042</b>	DCDP345667042
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission is regarding lands located to the south of Glenbrook at Lackaroe and Monkstown to the west of Laurel Hill.</p> <p>This submission requests the following in the forthcoming Development Plan for Monkstown: The zoning of the subject lands to be retained for residential use and included within the settlement boundary of this Metropolitan Town.</p> <p>The submission provides a detailed site context and description and included maps to illustrate. It states the site has an area of approximately 6.5 hectares and is located approximately 1.3km south of the Passage West town centre on the western periphery of the built-up area of the town, overlooking Cork Harbour. It states the site is located 450m from Strand Road connecting the site to Monkstown and Passage West and is located within walking distance of several bus stops. It notes to the immediate north lies Lackaroe road, and the site is bounded by a row of detached houses, agricultural lands, and the Lee View Place estate.</p> <p>It outlines Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework</p>



	<p>(NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>It states there is a Strategic Housing Development (SHD) application being prepared for these lands and it is anticipated this SHD application will be submitted to An Bord Pleanála over the coming months for residential development consisting of 174 no. residential units to include a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed units, crèche and the widening of the existing Laurel Hill road and footpath connection.</p> <p>It highlights that the subject site is currently zoned PW-R-06 and PW-R-07 in the LAP 2017 and these zonings are proposed to be removed in the draft plan. It states the purpose of this submission is to request that the Council reinstate the residential zoning for the subject sites and to zone the entire site for residential use.</p> <p>The submission outlines the services and facilities available in Passage West. It states the site is available and deliverable and will provide the opportunity to design residential development that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport and reduces car dependency, as well as contributing to local infrastructure improvements, which is in line with key national objectives to achieve compact and sustainable led growth.</p> <p>The submission requests the subject land be retained for residential use and included within the settlement boundary of this important Metropolitan Town. It questions the rationale for having only one small land parcel of 'Residential' zoned land to the southern side of town and states it would be more appropriate to have a more balanced residential zoning across the town.</p> <p>It states the development of these lands, and the upgrade works to the local infrastructure will allow for better pedestrian connections in the area and allow for a local access road to connect from the subject lands to lands further north. It notes the delivery of these infrastructure upgrades will improve access to the town's services and facilities for existing residents within the immediate area. It highlights that the subject lands are fully serviceable and can accommodate residential development in the short to medium term and should be retained for residential use and included within the settlement boundary of this important Metropolitan Town.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests to retain the residential zonings PW-R-06 and PW-R-07 as there is an SHD application being prepared for these sites.</li> <li>2. It questions the rationale for having only one small land parcel of 'Residential' zoned land to the southern side of town and states it would be more appropriate to have a more balanced residential zoning across the town.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with</li> </ol>

	<p>existing zonings. In the case of planning permission being granted, based on its existing zoning , prior to the implementation of the new Cork County Development Plan, the grant of permission will not be affected by any change to the zoning of the site.</p> <p>2. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures PW-R-04 to the south of the settlement was chosen based off a sequential approach. This site is located within walking distance to the town centre of Monkstown and has the potential to provide compact residential development in the settlement boundary of Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Paddy Quinlan</b>
<b>DCDP345543210</b>	DCDP345543210
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Patrick Cooney</b>
<b>DCDP344672045</b>	DCDP344672045
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission is regarding a landholding in the townland of Ballyhemiken. Two maps were included in the submission, which indicated the land acquired by CPO for the M28 which dissects the site and the site in the context of the Draft County Development Plan map of Carrigaline. The submissions states there are c.0.68 Ha. of the site to the South West of the

	<p>motorway and c.4.98 Ha. to the North.</p> <p>The submission notes details from the 2017 Master Plan for the Shannonpark lands located to the west of the proposed site. It notes that lands to the south of the proposed lands are proposed for zoning CL-RR-01 and lands to the south east proposed for zoning CL-HT-01. Lands to the east of the property include the Roadstone quarry and RY-I-03 zoning. It states the proposed site will be bordered on the northern side by the existing N28 which will revert to a regional road post the construction of the M28.</p> <p>The submission requests that the proposed site be zoned as follows: That the lands to the Southwest of Motorway (0.68 Ha.) be zoned to the natural boundary of the M28 under the zoning which applies to the Fernhill Golf Club lands of CL-RR-01.</p> <p>That the lands to the North of Motorway (4.98 Ha.) be zoned as lands suitable for Warehousing and Logistics given its proximity to Ringaskiddy with access to the redesignated N28 post M28 construction.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests two parcels of land be zoned adjacent to the M28 motorway as a Residential Reserve and for warehousing/logistics uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. The plan has already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality.</p> <p>Both sites are directly adjacent to the M28 route and could have the potential to impinge on its delivery. The noise pollution once the M28 is constructed from the subject site would be a potential issue. The zoning of these lands would be premature pending the delivery of the M28 route.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Patrick Coughlan</b>
<b>DCDP346079373</b>	DCDP346079373
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands situated in Ardnacloghy, Carrigaline. It states the site is fully serviceable and is located approximately 1.5km north of Carrigaline town centre and comprises of approximately 19.1 hectares and is bounded to the south by the permitted Carrigaline Educational Campus, Council Ref. No. 15/4388. The submission includes maps to illustrate the site.</p> <p>The submission requests the following provisions in the forthcoming CDP for Carrigaline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebalance the provision of public open space in Carrigaline by providing a new Green Infrastructure zoning objective on the northern side of the</li> </ul>

	<p>town;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the objectives outlined in CMATS in relation to the provision of public transport and the locations of future Park and Ride facilities are reflected in the Development Plan; and</li> <li>• Acknowledge the need to a balance approach to residential growth which facilitates opportunities for compact growth in close proximity to schools so as to encourage sustainable modes of transport.</li> </ul> <p>It states approximately 2.7 hectares of the landholding currently forms part of the lands zoned CL-U-09 in the Draft Plan, and the rest are located within the Metropolitan Greenbelt.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2022-28 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP).</p> <p>The submission proposes that in line the Main Policy Objectives of the Draft Plan and CMATS that the following be included the new Cork County Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional lands zoned for new Green Infrastructure on the northern side of Carrigaline to address the imbalance of open space provision for the town;</li> <li>• Improve the quality of amenities/open spaces and ensure adequate provision of amenities and open space is in line with the predicted population growth of Carrigaline; and</li> <li>• Ensure Carrigaline provides universal access to public spaces, green spaces and recreational spaces which are accessible and inclusive to people of all ages.</li> </ul> <p>It states the land can meet a number of key principals for development such as connectivity, accessibility and deliverability. It notes if Carrigaline is to develop as a Metropolitan Town, there will be a need to ensure that there is sufficient quantum of lands zoned to facilitate population targets, including headroom which will provide flexibility in land supply.</p> <p>It submits that the subject lands be developed in the medium term and should be designated as 'Residential Reserve' lands which would provide much needed family homes and housing for the elderly through the provision of independent living units being delivered in the area and provide for the longer-term housing requirements of Carrigaline Town. It states the lands are accessible, offer consolidation and are deliverable.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new 'Green Infrastructure' zoning and 'Residential Reserve' zoning. It requests the following specific objectives to be included: CL-GR-13: Active open Space. The provision of playing pitches, ancillary facilities and parking for the establishment of a sporting facility on these lands will be considered.</p>
--	---

	<p>CL-RR-02: Residential Reserve. This land will be a reserve for residential development as set out in objective ZU-3-12 of Chapter 18 Zoning and Land Use.</p> <p>It states the lands have the potential to link and improve pedestrian and cycle access from the Carrigaline Education Campus to parts of Shannon Park development which would encourage sustainable modes of transport.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission proposes that the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new 'Residential Reserve' zoning: CL-RR-02: Residential Reserve. This land will be a reserve for residential development as set out in objective ZU-3-12 of Chapter 18 Zoning and Land Use.</li> <li>2. Requests the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new 'Green Infrastructure' zoning and CL-GR-13: Active open Space. The provision of playing pitches, ancillary facilities and parking for the establishment of a sporting facility on these lands will be considered.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. The plan has already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality. The settlement boundary will not be extended as a result of this submission.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Phoebe Hadden</b>
<b>DCDP345611073</b>	DCDP345611073
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	privat
<b>DCDP346292185</b>	DCDP346292185
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards Crosshaven and Bays and outlines requests under the following headings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tourism: It states the village core needs a more specific attraction to extend the duration of holiday visits. It highlights that Ford Camden in years to come will be 100% self-sufficient with all sorts of attractions, food and accommodation. It notes access to water and the bays is imperative as an incentive for visitors to make a stop in village centre. It requests to develop a 'Slob' area with causeway and boardwalk, and infill under wall for parking and use for markets/festivals/music. It requests to create bus parking at the Royal Cork Yacht Club end, and combine with a one-way traffic system, and wider footpaths. It states this will give the businesses along the waterfront space for outdoor furniture, combined with the new causeway with 'permanent' water inside, a 'boulevard' experience can be created. It requests Fort Templebreedy to be developed for Camping/Campervans/Self Catering units with all the relevant services.</li> <li>2. Housing: It requests no more development until safe footpaths and cycle lanes have been created through a possible one-way traffic system to form a 'ring road.'</li> <li>3. Parking: It requests Park and Ride facilities at strategic locations during summer months.</li> <li>4. Walking: It requests to develop and/or improve new and existing walkways, and for the cliff walk to be made accessible and safe.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states the village core needs a more specific attraction to extend the duration of holiday visits.</li> <li>2. It notes access to water and the bays is imperative as an incentive for visitors to make a stop in village centre.</li> <li>3. It requests to develop a 'Slob' area with causeway and boardwalk, and infill under wall for parking and use for markets/festivals/music.</li> <li>4. It requests to create bus parking at the Royal Cork Yacht Club end, and combine with a one-way traffic system, and wider footpaths. It states this will give the businesses along the waterfront space for outdoor furniture, combined with the new causeway with 'permanent' water inside, a 'boulevard' experience can be created. It requests Fort Templebreedy to be developed for</li> </ol>

	<p>Camping/Campervans/Self Catering units with all the relevant services.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. It requests no more development until safe footpaths and cycle lanes have been created through a possible one-way traffic system to form a 'ring road.'</li> <li>6. It requests Park and Ride facilities at strategic locations during summer months.</li> <li>7. It requests to develop and/or improve new and existing walkways, and for the cliff walk to be made accessible and safe.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective CS-GO-03 address provision to enhance tourist facilities.</li> <li>2. Noted. Objective CS-GO-04 addresses the opportunity Crosshaven and Bays has as a tourist destination for water-related activities.</li> <li>3. Noted. This is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>4. Noted. It is proposed in the plan that a car park and picnic area are to be delivered adjacent to Templebreedy Fort.</li> <li>5. Noted. This is beyond the remit of the plan.</li> <li>6. The plan will not include the provision for a park and ride facility in the key village as this would potentially entail the extension of the development boundary and ongoing consultation with landowners.</li> <li>7. Noted. The plan supports the provision of walkways and green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. CS-GO-06 addresses this issue.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Roadstone Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP346033690</b>	DCDP346033690
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Outlines the spatial context of their landholding at Rafeen Quarry, strategically situated adjacent to the N28 between Ringaskiddy and Carrigaline. Details policy objectives of the National Planning Framework (NPO 2a, 8, 40), national strategic outcomes of the National Development Plan (NSO 2, 5, 6), contents of the Regional Spatial Economic Strategy for the Southern Region and the Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan, and policies and proposals of the Draft Plan as they relate to these lands in Rafeen.</p> <p>Requests that the landbank be zoned for Industrial and/ or General Business and Employment type use and should form part of the proposed Fernhill Urban Expansion Area Framework Masterplan.</p> <p>In support of this request, it is highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The population uplift target should be met with indigenous employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• Ringaskiddy is set to be a key employment area offering enhanced port facilities and the Council should consider the economies of scale to be achieved by zoning the site for industrial use, benefiting from the port area as the catalyst to attract investment.</li> <li>• The landbank offers the opportunity to generate further indigenous and local employment options that in turn would facilitate more sustainable commuter patterns.</li> <li>• The site should form part of the proposed 'Fernhill Urban Expansion Area</li> </ul>



	<p>Framework Masterplan' offering an alternative, yet complimentary industrial use to already proposed 'Residential Reserve (CL-RR-01)', 'High Technology Campus (CL-HT-01)', and 'Business (CL-B-02)' uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be carried out on a phased basis and would be representative of the Principals of sequential development.</li> <li>• The Framework Masterplan could incorporate a landscaped buffer between the eastern boundary of the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area and the development boundary of Ringaskiddy and such a buffer offers the opportunity to not only provide a form of demarcation between land parcels of disparate uses but also the opportunity to bring strategically located sites into use, whilst enhancing public open space areas.</li> <li>• The inclusion of the subject site as part of the Masterplan area will allow for a balance of quarry lands to be extracted, whilst the M28 is being constructed, complimented by the reuse of the lands post cessation of quarrying operations.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the landbank be zoned for Industrial and/ or General Business and Employment type use and should form part of the proposed Fernhill Urban Expansion Area Framework Masterplan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The proposed site is directly adjacent to the M28 route and could have the potential to impinge on its delivery.</p> <p>The extent of the site zoned Fernhill Urban Expansion Area was previously designated as a Strategic Land Reserve after detailed assessment of appropriate lands in the county. Zoning this site would risk merging the settlements of Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy.</p> <p>Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4. .</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Rob Casey</b>
<b>DCDP346291184</b>	DCDP346291184
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission focusses on the Site Specific Policy associated with lands at Crosshaven and Bays located along Fennell's Bay Road, Myrtleville and makes the following observations/requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft proposal to encourage that tourism related facilities, including accommodation and other developments are to be curtailed to within existing settlements (County Development Plan Objective TO 10-10: Tourism Facilities Volume One Main Policy Material of the draft Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028);</li> <li>• That County Development Plan Objective TO 10-10: Tourism Facilities be amended to promote/facilitate the reuse of existing disused, obsolete or derelict farm building for the purposes of tourism accommodation (farm diversification) irrespective of being located within existing settlements or within the wider rural area.;</li> <li>• That the Subject Lands at Fennell's Bay Road, Myrtleville be designated Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses to facilitate and manage the sustainable expansion of the Key Village of Crosshaven and</li> </ul>

	<p>Bays; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses is considered more appropriate and compatible which reflects more appropriately the current use associated with the lands and the pattern of development of immediate surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p>The submission contends that the irregular and fragmented application of the Development Boundaries around the Crosshaven and Bays cannot facilitate any appropriate level of growth, or infrastructure planning. It notes that growth associated with the rural areas outside of the Development Boundary of Crosshaven and Bays will have to be facilitated, especially having regards to the influence of Project Ireland 2040 and specifically National Policy Objective 19 and the resulting additional demand for housing within and along the peninsula.</p> <p>It notes that while it is acknowledged that draft County Development Plan Objective TO 10-10: Tourism Facilities encourages the development of tourism related facilities, including accommodation and other developments, such is curtailed/restricted to be located within existing settlements.</p> <p>It states that the facilitating and managing the sustainable expansion of Crosshaven and Bays will address the fragmented extent of the development boundary, including Fennel’s Bay and Myrtleville, thereby driving the sustainable residential, social and economic development of Crosshaven and Bays into the future in line with the aspirations of Project Ireland 2040.</p> <p>It states the data projects an annual growth of between 6 and 8 houses per annum in the 15 years between 2016 and 2031 within Crosshaven and Bays Key Village. It states the projection further confirms the need to provide for population growth in the order of 928 people by 2031, equating to a requirement for approx. 360 additional units over a period of 15 years based on the average household size. It notes a decline in average household size would likely correspond with a significant increase for demand for housing in the area.</p> <p>The amendments sought to the contents of the Draft Plan are intended to act as a catalyst to re- use redundant or obsolete farmyard complexes to the benefit of rural communities throughout County Cork. It states the design of these buildings is flexible having been continuously adapted through time to meet the changing agricultural needs of their owners.</p> <p>It requests that Objective TO10-10: Tourism Facilities as outlined under 10.14 Tourism Development and Facilities be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>"TO10-10: Tourism Facilities: Encourage tourism related facilities, including accommodation and other developments within existing settlements or existing disuse/obsolete/derelict farm buildings, subject to normal site suitability considerations where they can best support the regeneration of settlements, the provision of services, the general economic vitality of the</p>
--	--

	<p>settlement, and the reuse of existing farm buildings."</p> <p>That the Subject Lands at Fennell's Bay be zoned Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses, and states this is considered more appropriate and compatible and will reflect more appropriately the current use associated with the lands and the pattern of development of the surrounding area.</p> <p>It submits that the reuse of existing disused, obsolete or derelict farm buildings for the purposes of tourism accommodation (farm diversification) should be promoted/facilitated within the wider rural area, and that County Development Plan Objective TO 10-10: Tourism Facilities as outlined under 10.14 Tourism Development and Facilities of Volume One of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 be amended to facilitate the reuse of existing disused/obsolete/derelict farm buildings.</p> <p>It requests that the Subject Lands at Fennell's Bay Road, Myrtleville be zoned Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses considered more appropriate and compatible and which reflects more appropriately the current use associated with the lands and the pattern of development of immediate surrounding area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests the subject lands be zoned as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses and be incorporated into the development boundary and outlines reasons as to why this is appropriate.</li> <li>2. Requests an amendment to Objective TO10-10.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The development boundary is not being extended to incorporate this development. The plan has already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality.</li> <li>2. Noted. Objective TO 10-10 Tourism Facilities will be amended to include a new point (f).</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. See amendment No.1.10.17.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Robert Zaczek</b>
<b>DCDP345913767</b>	DCDP345913767
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the</p>

	ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Rodney Daunt</b>
<b>DCDP346081053</b>	DCDP346081053
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Rory Whelan</b>
<b>DCDP341053566</b>	DCDP341053566
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submissions requested that the main street in Carrigaline is made one way to allow greater access to pedestrians and to allow cafes to spill onto the street, similar to Clonakilty.

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests the main street in Carrigaline be made one way to allow for greater pedestrian access and to allow for cafes to spill out onto the street.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. This is an operational issue and is beyond the remit of the plan. The Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Enhancement Plan addresses public realm enhancement plans in Carrigaline.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>S A Andrews</b>
<b>DCDP346221641</b>	DCDP346221641
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>S. McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP345931752</b>	DCDP345931752
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the

	ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sarah Donovan</b>
<b>DCDP345610698</b>	DCDP345610698
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sean and Clara O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP343431773</b>	DCDP343431773
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission thanks the planners for maintaining the existing development boundaries of Myrtleville and keeping the density of development to low density. It states Myrtleville and the Bays are a

	wonderful amenity for both residents and visitors to enjoy and should be preserved for future generations to come.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests protection of the amenities the Bays offer.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan provides a sustainable policy framework to protect and enhance the settlements in Cork County.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sean Fitzpatrick</b>
<b>DCDP345907173</b>	DCDP345907173
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shamrocks Hurling and Football Club</b>
<b>DCDP346180187</b>	DCDP346180187
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission regarding Ringaskiddy makes the following comments and observations: It states the plan should set guidelines containing a sensible vision of what is best for the community and industry combined. It states it needs a change of attitude from Cork County Council appertaining to the community of Shanbally/ Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour area, and it should be a prime objective to give the people hope and optimism going forward. It notes there has been systematic and aggressive policy from Cork County Council to diminish the population of Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour, with a 50% decline in numbers. It states there has been a corresponding



	<p>decimation of essential services to the Community and the local people, and highlights the lack of services in the area.</p> <p>It states going forward it is essential to hold and maintain the current population numbers with opportunities to increase them. It notes this policy will allow the community to achieve better bonding, better quality of life and be less affected by the trials and tribulations experienced by large centres and satellite towns. It emphasises that the 2022-28 plan must do everything possible to propagate and duly increase the local population. It references future housing developments locally, some of which have received planning, and states Cork County Council should insist and request developers to make new houses available to the open market so that locals can have a fair chance of purchasing. It states block booking by speculators and investors must be outlawed.</p> <p>It states the Shamrocks Club has invested substantially in new buildings and playing facilities in Shanbally which were grant aided by The National Sports Council, Cork County Council and The GAA. It notes that they need the population numbers to hold and increase, which Cork County Council can make achievable by altering its attitude to the Shanbally/Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour catchment area. It states the Shamrocks GAA Club caters for approx. 150 Men, Women and children incorporating GAA and Ladies Football Clubs.</p> <p>It notes the County Council should independently make land available for the purpose to build Student Accommodation, servicing the NMCI, and emphasises such accommodation is now common policy and practice in the periphery of all Third-Level colleges and institutions. It states local housing should be for local families and first-time buyers.</p> <p>It highlights that Cork County Council should consult with the IDA and investigate the under-use of their portfolio of land in the Shanbally/Ringaskiddy area and possibly purchase suitable land for housing between Carrigaline and the Shanbally/Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour Area. It notes a full review of Safety and Emergency plans must come under severe scrutiny, as this will benefit all people, local residents, Industry workers, schoolchildren and the constant flow of people commuting in and out every day.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states the plan should set guidelines containing a sensible vision of what is best for the community and industry combined. It states it needs a change of attitude from Cork County Council appertaining to the community of Shanbally/ Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour area, and it should be a prime objective to give the people hope and optimism going forward.</li> <li>2. It notes there has been systematic and aggressive policy from Cork County Council to diminish the population of Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour, with a 50% decline in numbers. It states there has been a corresponding decimation of essential services to the Community and the local people, and highlights the lack of services in the area.</li> <li>3. It states going forward it is essential to hold and maintain the current population numbers with opportunities to increase them. It notes this policy will allow the community to achieve better bonding, better quality of life and be less affected by the trials and</li> </ol>

	<p>tribulations experienced by large centres and satellite towns. It emphasises that the 2022-28 plan must do everything possible to propagate and duly increase the local population.</p> <p>4. It references future housing developments locally, some of which have received planning, and states Cork County Council should insist and request developers to make new houses available to the open market so that locals can have a fair chance of purchasing. It states block booking by speculators and investors must be outlawed.</p> <p>5. It notes that they need the population numbers to hold and increase, which Cork County Council can make achievable by altering its attitude to the Shanbally/Ringaskiddy Lower Harbour catchment area.</p> <p>6. It notes a full review of Safety and Emergency plans must come under severe scrutiny, as this will benefit all people, local residents, Industry workers, schoolchildren and the constant flow of people commuting in and out every day.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4 and 5: As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings. Cork County Council are intending to prepare a Future Employment and Land Suitability Study that will inform the approach to zoned employment lands across the county. See Amendment No. 1.8.4. . The plan has already identified lands for future development of the town to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and help enhance its viability and vitality.</p> <p>6: Noted. The plan supports Safety and Emergency plans.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shanbally Developments Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346167304</b>	DCDP346167304
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands located just south of the village of Shanbally, adjacent to the existing Coolmore Close and Coolmore Gardens residential area. It states the Hibernian Football club is located on adjacent lands to the west. It states the area is served by the 224 bus route which stops at the Shanbally Grotto location a short distance to the East of the subject lands. It notes the area is characterized by the presence of several large pharmaceutical multinational operations, the nearest being Novartis, Janssen and Pfizer.</p> <p>The submission requests that the lands be re-assigned a zoning objective of ZU 18-9: Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses to better reflect the existing pattern of development in this area and the established Principal of residential development on the lands.</p> <p>It outlines Ringaskiddy's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the County Development Plan 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021. The submission includes maps and images to</p>

	<p>illustrate.</p> <p>The submission discussed in detail the suitability of the subject lands for development, the need for balanced development in Ringaskiddy, employment led growth, sustainable travel, and the protection of the principal function.</p> <p>The submission made observation/requests as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states the subject lands to the south of the existing Shanbally Village is suitable for residential development, can be easily serviced during the lifetime of the upcoming plan and should be afforded a suitable zoning objective to allow for growth in Ringaskiddy.</li> <li>• It states the zoning objective applied to the lands in the Draft Plan is not reflective of existing lands uses in this area and the planning precedent on the lands.</li> <li>• It notes disapproval with the vision for Ringaskiddy as outlined in the Draft County Plan which envisages near static growth and considers this approach to be at odds with National and Regional Policy, as well as the potential for Ringaskiddy to contribute to the delivery of much needed housing in the Metropolitan area.</li> <li>• It suggests a more balanced approach to the development of Ringaskiddy would result in a more sustainable settlement while still safeguarding it as a strategic employment location or National importance.</li> <li>• It states an increase in the resident population through the provision of permanent housing is required to support the construction of the proposed school and existing community facilities including GAA Club and Soccer club, both of which are located in Shanbally in close proximity to the subject lands.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It states the subject lands to the south of the existing Shanbally Village is suitable for residential development, can be easily serviced during the lifetime of the upcoming plan and should be afforded a suitable zoning objective to allow for growth in Ringaskiddy.</li> <li>2. It states the zoning objective applied to the lands in the Draft Plan is not reflective of existing lands uses in this area and the planning precedent on the lands.</li> <li>3. It notes disapproval with the vision for Ringaskiddy as outlined in the Draft County Plan which envisages near static growth and considers this approach to be at odds with National and Regional Policy, as well as the potential for Ringaskiddy to contribute to the delivery of much needed housing in the Metropolitan area.</li> <li>4. It suggests a more balanced approach to the development of Ringaskiddy would result in a more sustainable settlement while still safeguarding it as a strategic employment location or National importance.</li> <li>5. It states an increase in the resident population through the provision of permanent housing is required to support the construction of the proposed school and existing community facilities including GAA Club and Soccer club, both of which are located in Shanbally in close proximity to the subject lands.</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. The subject site be zoned as Existing Residential, Mixed Residential and Other Uses to reflect the land use on the site and area.</li> <li>2. The subject site will be zoned as Existing Residential, Mixed Residential and Other Uses to reflect the land use on the site and area.</li> <li>3. Ringaskiddy, as a Strategic Employment Location, priority was to enhance the employment opportunities and port related activities in the settlement. Ringaskiddy has received a 45 unit target to meet within the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>4. Noted. As above.</li> <li>5. Noted. As above.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 and 2: See amendment 4.1.5.6.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> <li>5. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shane Somers</b>
<b>DCDP345333058</b>	DCDP345333058
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sheila Stokes</b>
<b>DCDP344894316</b>	DCDP344894316
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shrewsbury and Fernhill Residents Group (Point of Contact - David Murphy)</b>
<b>DCDP345924074</b>	DCDP345924074
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states the Shrewsbury and Fernhill Residents Group object to the proposed zoning of the Fernhill Urban Expansion Area within the emerging Cork County Development Plan and includes signatures from the group. It requests that the Council maintain these lands within the greenbelt as per the adopted Cork County Development Plan 2014. The submission states the key issues with the proposed zoning of these lands are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the zoning of lands at Fernhill is premature pending the completion of the M28, due to open at the earliest in 2027, and the Carrigaline Eastern Outer Distributor Road. It states these lands should not be zoned in the forthcoming plan.</li> <li>• It notes the development of these lands will result in the coalescence of the settlements of Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy, eroding the greenbelt and entirely undermining Metropolitan Greenbelt policies. It notes within county Cork it would be hard to find a situation where a green belt is more needed than in this location.</li> <li>• It highlights that the local road network in the site area is not suitable to facilitate and support the development of these lands.</li> <li>• It notes there is no identified requirement for additional residential development and business and technology uses at this location during the emerging plan period. It notes these lands do not fall within Tier 1 or 2 categories as defined by the National Planning Framework and thus should not be zoned for development.</li> <li>• It highlights that the zoning of these lands is not consistent with Cork County Council's own assessment of Strategic Land Reserve (SLR) 2 Fernhill/Carrigaline North East which identified a number of constraints pertaining to the lands at Fernhill.</li> </ul> <p>The submission outlines a detailed site location and development context. It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the County Development Plan 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>The submission outlined a case for retaining Fernhill Lands within the Metropolitan Greenbelt under the following headings: Prematurity of</p>

	Proposed Zoning for Fernhill Expansion Area, Erosion of the Greenbelt, Poor Condition Local Road Network, Requirement for Residential Reserve and Employment Lands, Need for Residential Reserve, Technological Campus and Business Lands and Strategic Land Reserve Assessment.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The zoning of lands at Fernhill is premature pending the completion of the M28, due to open at the earliest in 2027, and the Carrigaline Eastern Outer Distributor Road. It states these lands should not be zoned in the forthcoming plan.</li> <li>2. It notes the development of these lands will result in the coalescence of the settlements of Carrigaline and Ringaskiddy, eroding the greenbelt and entirely undermining Metropolitan Greenbelt policies. It notes within county Cork it would be hard to find a situation where a green belt is more needed than in this location.</li> <li>3. It highlights that the local road network in the site area is not suitable to facilitate and support the development of these lands.</li> <li>4. It notes there is no identified requirement for additional residential development and business and technology uses at this location during the emerging plan period. It notes these lands do not fall within Tier 1 or 2 categories as defined by the National Planning Framework and thus should not be zoned for development.</li> <li>5. It highlights that the zoning of these lands is not consistent with Cork County Council's own assessment of Strategic Land Reserve (SLR) 2 Fernhill/Carrigaline North East which identified a number of constraints pertaining to the lands at Fernhill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4 and 5: Noted. Carrigaline is the largest town in the County and has experienced significant population and housing growth over a long period of time. Also, there is a lack of sufficient employment land within the town which influences the high car dependency. IDA have indicated that there is a requirement to identify additional employment lands in the area. The proposal to develop the Fernhill UEA is a prudent and strategic response to these issues ensuring that future housing and employment land supply is properly planned for over the lifetime of the Plan. The proposal has been fully assessed as part of the preparation of the Carrigaline Transport and Public Realm Strategy (TPREP) to ensure that it has strong sustainable walking and cycling links with the town and the town centre to encourage modal shift away from cars. Development of these lands will be subject to other lands been developed or shown not to be available and subject to the opening of the M28 and the preparation of a Framework Plan which will address the issues raised.</p> <p>The Local Authority consider the identification of these lands for more detailed planning over the lifetime of the Plan as the prudent proper planning approach to help guide the future development of Carrigaline in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>It is intended to revise the requirements of the Framework Plan to ensure that the future development of the site makes provision for a strategic landscape corridor with Ringaskiddy to be retained.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Simon &amp; Linda Nicholson</b>
<b>DCDP345976542</b>	DCDP345976542
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states the submitters are residents in the vicinity of the proposed walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02, and are objecting on the basis of the following reasons:</p> <p>1) It states the proposed area in question is an area of undisturbed local wildlife, with many rare species of birds and animals noted nesting and frequenting in the area. It states Barn Owls, Buzzards, Peregrine Falcons, Red Squirrels and a host of prey that sustains these species (amongst other wild animals) would all be directly impacted and displaced by the encroachment of human presence on their natural habitat.</p> <p>2) It states the proposed walkway crosses various farmlands, which can spread disease and unnecessary risks between livestock, and that the farmlands in question are live working farms. It notes human curiosities will lead to people leaving outlined walkways where they will come in contact with livestock and machinery. It states that agriculture has the highest accident rate of any industry in Ireland, and that people unacquainted with agriculture may find themselves confronted by unknown dangers.</p> <p>3) It states anti-social behaviour, littering, underage drinking, vandalism will be encouraged to these previously untouched areas.</p> <p>4) It notes the submitters being in close vicinity of the walkways state they already suffer from a high daily frequency of trespassers using nearby farmland and crossing private property as a shortcut for nearby beaches. It states such walkways will encourage this at an extreme level.</p> <p>5) It notes a local walkway through the Cruachan was recently destroyed by so called "development".</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission objects to the inclusion of CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 in relation to the disturbance of local wildlife, the walkways dissecting farmlands, anti-social behaviour, and trespassing on farmland.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The walkways CS-U-01 and CS-U-02 have been included in the development plan since 1996. These lines are indicative walkways and not existing routes. See objective CS-GO-06, which states the Council will work in co-operation with landowners to deliver the proposed amenity routes.</p> <p>See amendment no. 1.18.8, which states New roads, walkways and cycleways are also included on zoning maps under this heading and it should be noted that such lines are indicative only and are subject to agreement with land owners and other considerations as appropriate.</p> <p>CS-GR-11 Protect woodland area for passive open space use, aims to protect these woodlands from further development.</p>



<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Simon Brewitt, Chartered Engineer</b>
<b>DCDP342758554</b>	DCDP342758554
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to issues arising from the integration of the proposals in the Draft Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP) with those set out in the Draft County Development Plan, with particular reference to their impact on the existing road network in the south-western part of the town. Reference is made to Objectives relating to the Carrigaline TPREP, such as CL-GO-05 and CL-GO-12 which refer to supporting and implementing the provisions of the TPREP.</p> <p>The submission requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the Transportation Strategy – Option Number. 7 as described in the TPREP, be incorporated into the Plan,</li> <li>• That the route for the Western Outer Relief Road as shown in the Draft Plan, Objective CL-U-04, be replaced with the recommended route for a future Southern Outer Distributor Road, West and South of the Development Boundary as described in the TPREP,</li> <li>• That the Plan should include an Objective to upgrade the Mountain Road to form part of the Primary Pedestrian and Cycle Network as described in the TPREP and the proposal to use it as part of the Western Outer Relief Road, Objective CL-U-07, be omitted from the Plan,</li> <li>• That Objective CL-R-10 be amended to require that primary access to any development is from the R611 and that access from the Mountain Road is permitted only when the road has been upgraded and then limited to that which is compatible with its use by pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Transportation Strategy – Option Number. 7 as described in the TPREP, be incorporated into the Plan,</li> <li>2. That the route for the Western Outer Relief Road as shown in the Draft Plan, Objective CL-U-04, be replaced with the recommended route for a future Southern Outer Distributor Road, West and South of the Development Boundary as described in the TPREP,</li> <li>3. That the Plan should include an Objective to upgrade the Mountain Road to form part of the Primary Pedestrian and Cycle Network as described in the TPREP and the proposal to use it as part of the Western Outer Relief Road, Objective CL-U-07, be omitted from the Plan,</li> <li>4. That Objective CL-R-10 be amended to require that primary access to any development is from the R611 and that access from the Mountain Road is permitted only when the road has been upgraded and then limited to that which is compatible with its use by pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option 7 will be included as an insert map into the plan, and will be accompanied by additional text. See Amendment 4.1.3.21.</li> <li>2. The route of CL-U-04 is a long-term indicative line shown on the zoning map. Elements of the TPREP will be included to reflect the plans infrastructural and public realm ambitions.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. CL-U-07 will be maintained to allow future access to CL-R-10 after its upgrade.</p> <p>4. Access to the CL-R-10 site is set to be provided from the R611 and Mountain Road, following its proposed upgrade.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Slawomir Ponikowski</b>
<b>DCDP345924930</b>	DCDP345924930
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose. The submission then describes how to make a submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sonia O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345952452</b>	DCDP345952452
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission thanks Cork County Council for maintaining the Green Infrastructure and the Planning Development Boundary in the Crosshaven and Bays area. It notes key decisions like this have allowed for the natural movement of wildlife in the area and allows the wildlife to continue to flourish. It states any further development in this area would greatly impact the village as a tourist area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission supports the inclusion of the Green Infrastructure zonings in the Development Plan in Crosshaven and Bays.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Stephen o Driscoll</b>
<b>DCDP343374732</b>	DCDP343374732
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Taurus Developments Limited</b>
<b>DCDP345759280</b>	DCDP345759280
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission focusses on the Site Specific Policy associated with Specific Policy Area CS-X-01 located in Crosshaven and Bays and specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft proposal to apply Special Policy Areas CS-X-01 to the Subject Lands;</li> <li>• Paragraph 1.6.54 of Volume Four South Cork of the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021; the development of a hotel and “a limited amount of housing.”</li> <li>• Special Policy Areas CS-X-01 lands which have failed to deliver on the development of the subject lands over successive plans and policies, due to a regime of successive overly prescriptive site development policy and objectives; and</li> <li>• That Special Policy Areas CS-X-01 be amended to read as follows: Allow for the provision of a mixed-use hotel and residential development responding to site specific visual amenity, natural and architectural heritage, specific site characteristics and surrounding context. All development on the site is subject to a landscaping scheme and the retention of the existing tree belt.</li> </ul> <p>It states the failure of subject lands to develop is a result of the inclusion of a regime comprising over prescriptive objectives across successive plans. It states no flexibility is provided in the form of development which can be accommodated. It emphasises that the over prescriptive Special Policy</p>

	<p>Areas CS-X-01 Lands makes the development of the lands unachievable and/or unviable.</p> <p>The submission requests that Cork County Council employ less prescriptive objectives which facilitate flexibly in design and promote architectural innovation to achieve priority developments within the settlements of the county.</p> <p>It states the amendment of CS-X-01 Development Objective is intended to act as a catalyst, driving Crosshaven into the future in line with aspirations of Ireland 2040 for sustainable development.</p> <p>The submission includes maps and images to illustrate the site and location.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The submission raises issues regarding the CS-X-01 zoning, requesting a less prescriptive zoning objective for the site and suggests wording for the objective.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	CS-X-01 has provision to accommodate tourist accommodation on a sensitive site. All development on the site is subject to a landscaping scheme and the retention of the existing tree belt. The sensitive nature of the site requires innovative design to best reflect and protect the unique nature of the site. The objective is reflective of the sensitive nature of the site giving its location in the village and proximity to Crosshaven House. The detailing of the site would have to be a part of a proposal when applying for planning on the site. No change to the objective is required.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Teresa O'Toole</b>
<b>DCDP346073265</b>	DCDP346073265
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Terry O'Horgan</b>
<b>DCDP345547053</b>	DCDP345547053
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>TFT Construction Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345799718</b>	DCDP345799718
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission is regarding lands at Marmullane which can be accessed from an existing development from Church Hill (Ard Chuain estate) permitted under Cork County Council Ref No: 13/5607. The site is approximately 0.4km from the town centre of Passage West.</p> <p>The submission provides a detailed site context and description and included maps to illustrate. It states the site is located within the built up area of the town and currently consists of mature trees and is completely surrounded by residential development, which is either recently completed or is under construction. It states to the north and east lies the estates of Árd Chuain and Beechcourt and to the immediate south lies the estates of Hillcrest and Bloomingdale.</p> <p>The submission requests the following provisions in the forthcoming Plan for Passage West:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council rezone the lands from PW-GC-02 (Open Space) to PW-R-03</li> </ul>

	<p>for residential use in keeping with the vision for Passage West which will provide ongoing residential development taking place including the adjoining lands (Ref No. 13/5607) for 12 no. serviced sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To update the Specific Development Objectives Table 4.1.13 for Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown which specially outlines the objectives for PW-R-03 and the 3-no. remaining residential zones within Passage West.</li> </ul> <p>It outlines Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown’s role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing policy from the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>It states these lands could enhance connections within the residential areas of Pembroke and improve the connections within the settlements of the surrounding residential area and to the town of Passage West. It notes the subject lands represent well serviced and highly connected lands in line with the vision of the Draft Plan which can be defined as Tier 1 Serviced Lands and therefore should be rezoned in the Draft Plan from PW-GC-02 Open Space to PW-R-03 Residential use.</p> <p>It notes the subject site could facilitate and improve connectivity within the settlement boundary and would contribute to the delivery of consolidated and compact growth within Passage West through the construction of infill residential development within an existing residential area.</p> <p>It states it is illogical to propose the subject lands as PW-GC-02 for open space as it would not be in keeping with the permitted development which provides access to the lands. It states any new development can be planned to provide for the retention and protection of the scrub/transitional woodland where possible and integrated into areas to be retained as open space. It states from an urban design and development management perspective, the provision of housing on these lands would be more appropriate.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Council rezone the lands from PW-GC-02 (Open Space) to PW-R-03 for residential use in keeping with the vision for Passage West which will provide ongoing residential development taking place including the adjoining lands (Ref No. 13/5607) for 12 no. serviced sites.</li> <li>2. To update the Specific Development Objectives Table 4.1.13 for Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown which specially outlines the objectives for PW-R-03 and the 3-no. remaining residential zones within Passage West.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. As a result of the Core Strategy targets for Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown and regarding its 12 individual site layout, the designation of this site as residential was no longer required. PW-R-03 has been zoned within Existing Residential, Mixed Residential and Other Uses. See amendment 4.1.4.4.</li> </ol>

	4. Noted. Table 4.1.13 has been updated to include the residential zonings in the settlement of Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>The Kenneally Family</b>
<b>DCDP346214228</b>	DCDP346214228
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission is regarding lands located at Rockenham House, Pembroke, to the north of the town of Passage West.</p> <p>This submission requests the following in the forthcoming Development Plan for Passage West:  The proposed site be zoned either as 'Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses' (reflecting the existing and long-established residential use of the site) or for low density residential development in line with the adjoining PW-R-01 lands to the south.</p> <p>The submission provides a detailed site context and description and included maps to illustrate. It states access is from the R610 which runs from the N28 to the west through Rochestown and past the site and through to Passage West. It states adjoining the site are Aldi, a soccer pitch, and a large residential development, Harbour Heights. It states the site is located approximately 1.3km south of the Passage West town centre on the northern periphery of the built-up area of the town in an area characterised by a mix of low density and larger residential estate development, and overlooks Cork Harbour.</p> <p>It outlines Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>The submission states the subject lands are fully serviceable and can accommodate low-density residential development in the short term and states they should be included within the settlement boundary and not within the Metropolitan Greenbelt.</p> <p>It notes the site will directly benefit from the recently announced Passage Railway Greenway Improvement Scheme. The submission outlines the services and facilities available in Passage West.</p> <p>It states the limited number of sites proposed to be zoned for residential development and the uncertainty on the deliverability of all of these sites within Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown, means that there are limited opportunities available for future residents, particularly in relation to lands zoned for low density residential development.</p> <p>It states the site is available and deliverable and will provide the opportunity to design residential development that prioritises walking,</p>



	cycling and public transport and reduces car dependency, as well as contributing to local infrastructure improvements, which is in line with key national objectives to achieve compact and sustainable led growth.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This submission proposes a site be zoned either as 'Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses' or for low density residential development in line with the adjoining PW-R-01 lands to the south.</li> <li>2. Notes there are limited opportunities available for future residents, particularly in relation to lands zoned for low density residential development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. Noted. PW-R-01 and PW-R-04 are both designated as Medium B density in Table 4.1.13. Infill development within settlements is also encouraged within the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>The Kenneally Family</b>
<b>DCDP346145646</b>	DCDP346145646
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission is regarding lands located at Rockenham House, Pembroke, to the north of the town of Passage West.</p> <p>This submission requests the following in the forthcoming Development Plan for Passage West: The proposed site be zoned either as 'Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses' (reflecting the existing and long-established residential use of the site) or for low density residential development in line with the adjoining PW-R-01 lands to the south.</p> <p>The submission provides a detailed site context and description and included maps to illustrate. It states access is from the R610 which runs from the N28 to the west through Rochestown and past the site and through to Passage West. It states adjoining the site are Aldi, a soccer pitch, and a large residential development, Harbour Heights. It states the site is located approximately 1.3km south of the Passage West town centre on the northern periphery of the built-up area of the town in an area characterised by a mix of low density and larger residential estate development, and overlooks Cork Harbour.</p> <p>It outlines Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p>

	<p>The states the subject lands are fully serviceable and can accommodate low-density residential development in the short term and states they should be included within the settlement boundary and not within the Metropolitan Greenbelt.</p> <p>It notes the site will directly benefit from the recently announced Passage Railway Greenway Improvement Scheme. The submission outlines the services and facilities available in Passage West.</p> <p>It states the limited number of sites proposed to be zoned for residential development and the uncertainty on the deliverability of all of these sites within Passage West/Glenbrook/Monkstown, means that there are limited opportunities available for future residents, particularly in relation to lands zoned for low density residential development.</p> <p>It states the site is available and deliverable and will provide the opportunity to design residential development that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport and reduces car dependency, as well as contributing to local infrastructure improvements, which is in line with key national objectives to achieve compact and sustainable led growth.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This submission proposes a site be zoned either as 'Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses' or for low density residential development in line with the adjoining PW-R-01 lands to the south.</li> <li>2. Notes there are limited opportunities available for future residents, particularly in relation to lands zoned for low density residential development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. Noted. PW-R-01 and PW-R-04 are both designated as Medium B density in Table 4.1.13. Infill development within settlements is also encouraged within the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>The O'Mahony Family</b>
<b>DCDP345776174</b>	DCDP345776174
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission regards lands situated in Kilmoney, Carrigaline South. It states the site is fully serviceable and is well connected by road infrastructure providing ease of access to the site.</p> <p>The submission provides context to Carrigaline, discussing its status as a Metropolitan Town, the significant amount of development which took place over the last few years, and its distinctive identity as a Metropolitan Town which serves as an important residential alternative to Cork City and its Environs. The submission included maps to illustrate the location of the site.</p>

	<p>It states the subject lands measure 8 hectares approximately and are situated in Kilmoney, 2km to the southwest of the town centre. It notes the lands are bounded by the Mountain Road to the south, Forrest Road to the north, Kilmoney Woods is located on the eastern boundary and the western boundary is bounded by one-off dwellings and agricultural land.</p> <p>It states there is an agreement in place by virtue of a Deed of Conveyance allowing the vendors the right to connect in with roads and services within the previously owned and now developed lands in Kilmoney Woods, making the lands fully serviced and immediately available for development.</p> <p>It outlines Carrigaline role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and Carrigaline Transportation and Public Realm Enhancement Plan (TPREP).</p> <p>It states if Carrigaline is to deliver on its strategic function as a Metropolitan Town, driving growth at a sub-regional level, the strategic planning policy context must support viable housing development during the lifetime of the forthcoming Development Plan. It states it considers that the quantum of residentially zoned lands within the Shannonpark masterplan area may not be adequate to support the housing targets in the short to medium term due to the requirement for significant infrastructure provision. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term.</p> <p>It states the proposed route of the Outer Western Relief Road dissects the western section of the subject lands in a north-south direction, and that the western relief road will in time become the medium-long term boundary for the settlement. It states is could be considered feasible to zone the lands for residential use while maintaining a suitable buffer for future provision of the outer relief road.</p> <p>It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council's Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>It states the worsening housing crisis, compounded by the Covid-19 emergency and the construction shutdowns since March 2020, means the delivery of housing in prime locations is imperative. It states the local authority must consider the best and most efficient ways of delivering housing units in the short to medium term.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the settlement boundary of Carrigaline be extended to provide a new residential zoning objective CL-R-16: Medium A Residential Development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission requests a new zoning for residential development in Carrigaline and includes an objective for the site.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It states there is an agreement in place by virtue of a Deed of Conveyance allowing the vendors the right to connect in with roads and services within the previously owned and now developed lands in Kilmoney Woods.</li> <li>3. It notes it is imperative that there is sufficient lands supply available for short to medium term delivery of housing units to meet the future projected growth of town, and considers the subject lands to be suited to accommodate some of the growth projections for Carrigaline in the short to medium term.</li> <li>4. It notes the Draft CDP has identified new lands for employment uses to the north of the settlement (CL-HT-01 and CL-B-02), and there will need to be housing development delivered in tandem to the employment lands to reduce car-based commuting.</li> <li>5. It states the proposals outlined in the Carrigaline TPREP, including the Strategic and Primary network routes have the potential to further connect the subject lands to the entire settlement of Carrigaline, including the town centre via means of active travel, which is consistent with objectives regarding the promotion of active travel and compliments the Council's Climate Action Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the revised Core Strategy figures for Carrigaline MD, which will form part of an amendment, additional lands for residential use are not required as the target has been met with existing zonings.</li> <li>2. The Deed of Conveyance is Noted.</li> <li>3. Noted. Chapter 2, Core Strategy addresses the land supply needed to deliver housing units to meet future projected growth.</li> <li>4. Noted. The Fernhill Urban Expansion Area (UEA) is subject to the delivery of the M28 and is subject to a masterplan. A residential reserve is also located within the Fernhill UEA which would be developed in tandem with the employment lands.</li> <li>5. Noted. The plan will include elements, such as maps and text from the Carrigaline TPREP. See Amendment 4.1.3.21.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Thermo Fisher Scientific</b>
<b>DCDP346173602</b>	DCDP346173602
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests an amendment to the draft plan text for a company name change from Smithkline Beecham (Cork) Ltd. and GSK GlaxoSmithkline to Thermo Fisher Scientific Cork relating to lands at Currabinny, Carrigaline, Co. Cork.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests update to company names in Ringaskiddy.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan aims to provide the most up to date information available and will reflect the correct company names within the text of the plan in Volume 4, Chapter 1, Carrigaline Municipal District.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment 4.1.5.3.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tracton Biodiversity Group</b>
<b>DCDP345654039</b>	DCDP345654039

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>The submission outlines observations and recommendations on the flooding, water quality and biodiversity risks and impacts of development in the Minane Bridge and Fountainstown Bay areas.</p> <p>It states the following is needed relating to the vision for Minane Bridge ‘ to promote sympathetic development which does not impact on the groundwater sensitivity of the area and to support the development and regeneration of the village core in line with the availability of services’.</p> <p>The submission references 5 general County Development Plan Objectives, including – Development in Flood Risk Areas and Climate Change Considerations.</p> <p>The submission outlined the following observations and concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It states the amenity Walk U-01, encroaches into the identified flood risk area and requests this path be altered to allow for inevitable flooding, to retain the willows and have in addition a green corridor and pollinator meadow, the planting of which be in consultation with Tracton Biodiversity Group. It states the consideration that ‘The development is assessed not to have the potential to give rise to negative or adverse impacts on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites (Vol 1)’ applies in this instance to pNHA site Minane Marsh.</li> <li>2) It states Minane Marsh is a pNHA area and this site comprises the narrow Ringabella estuary incorporating flooded wet fields supporting marsh vegetation and colonising woodland. It notes the site is important for birds, butterflies and other insects and that biodiversity has suffered increasing destruction due to drainage and other groundworks. It notes the most protected species in that area and states it deserves protection and restoration to high ecological status. It states there is considerable risk from flooding already, where the effects of drainage and increased water levels due to rainfall are causing concern for residents of River Valley estate. It requests that mitigation would consist of the protection and restoration of Minane Marsh.</li> <li>3) It states unpurified water is entering Fountainstown beach, a Blue Flag beach. It references Volume 1:11.3.1.</li> <li>4) It notes regarding Minane River, that there are two outfalls from estates and raw sewage from Spruce Grove estate. It recommends that water samples are taken regularly and monitoring for the impact of associated toxins on biodiversity of riverbank, freshwater marsh, saltwater marsh by the dam, and in the SPA below it. It states a Cork Harbour SPA is within the estuary of the Minane River. It notes in Objective U-01 that the proposed path appears to overlap the WWTP reedbed, which is an integral part of the existing WWTP and any interference in the reedbed has potential impact on water quality. It states the waste water treatment plant for River Valley estate is not outlined in the draft plan and requests that this be identified and marked as sensitive infrastructure.</li> <li>5) It notes there is a diversity of geological features and habitats in the area and requests that the Minane River valley be treated with the same consideration as locations on the list of Priority Areas for Action in Vol 1:11.3.6. It states the pNHA and other sites in the Minane river valley have indicators of qualifying interests, equal to sites of greater protected status</li> </ol>
----------------------------------	--

	<p>such as SAC European sites/ SPAs /NHAs.</p> <p>Regarding Objective GC-02, the submission requests that this entire stretch of mature deciduous woodland be protected as most of the mature deciduous woodland in the area lies to the north of the village.</p> <p>6) It notes that the identification of flood risk areas carries with it an urgency regarding the acceleration, intensity and estimated risk levels of climate change events.</p> <p>7) Regarding Groundwater Protection it requests that the whole area to the north be protected under a combination of objective DB-02 and GC-02.</p> <p>It states the Climate and Biodiversity emergencies demand a transformation in County Cork and there is urgent need to meet commitments to the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2030. It states Climate action (SDG13), mitigation of risks, biodiversity protection and restoration must be central to every policy in the County Development Plan and the benefits clearly communicated, supporting behaviour change in people and communities is a major component. It notes that Minane Bridge and Minane river valley consists of a wide variety of vulnerable habitats and species, some with protected status which are threatened by flooding, drainage, clearance and other methods of destruction resulting in escalating ecocide.</p> <p>It requests the plan include the greater Minane river valley as the context for the vision for the community. It states urgent attention is required and protection is necessary to restore depleted habitats, species, water quality. It states the engagement of the Council with local people and groups should acknowledge their knowledge, expertise, skills and connection to this place.</p>
Principal Issues Raised	<p>1) It states the amenity Walk U-01, encroaches into the identified flood risk area and requests this path be altered to allow for inevitable flooding, to retain the willows and have in addition a green corridor and pollinator meadow, the planting of which be in consultation with Tracton Biodiversity Group. It states the consideration that ‘The development is assessed not to have the potential to give rise to negative or adverse impacts on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites (Vol 1)’ applies in this instance to pNHA site Minane Marsh.</p> <p>2) It states Minane Marsh is a pNHA area and this site comprises the narrow Ringabella estuary incorporating flooded wet fields supporting marsh vegetation and colonising woodland. It notes the site is important for birds, butterflies and other insects and that biodiversity has suffered increasing destruction due to drainage and other groundworks. It notes the most protected species in that area and states it deserves protection and restoration to high ecological status. It states there is considerable risk from flooding already, where the effects of drainage and increased water levels due to rainfall are causing concern for residents of River Valley estate. It requests that mitigation would consist of the protection and restoration of Minane Marsh.</p> <p>3) It states unpurified water is entering Fountainstown beach, a Blue Flag beach. It references Volume 1:11.3.1.</p> <p>4) It notes regarding Minane River, that there are two outfalls from estates and raw sewage from Spruce Grove estate. It recommends that water</p>

	<p>samples are taken regularly and monitoring for the impact of associated toxins on biodiversity of riverbank, freshwater marsh, saltwater marsh by the dam, and in the SPA below it. It states a Cork Harbour SPA is within the estuary of the Minane River. It notes in Objective U-01 that the proposed path appears to overlap the WWTP reedbed, which is an integral part of the existing WWTP and any interference in the reedbed has potential impact on water quality. It states the waste water treatment plant for River Valley estate is not outlined in the draft plan and requests that this be identified and marked as sensitive infrastructure.</p> <p>5) It notes there is a diversity of geological features and habitats in the area and requests that the Minane River valley be treated with the same consideration as locations on the list of Priority Areas for Action in Vol 1:11.3.6. It states the pNHA and other sites in the Minane river valley have indicators of qualifying interests, equal to sites of greater protected status such as SAC European sites/ SPAs /NHAs.</p> <p>Regarding Objective GC-02, the submission requests that this entire stretch of mature deciduous woodland be protected as most of the mature deciduous woodland in the area lies to the north of the village.</p> <p>6) It notes that the identification of flood risk areas carries with it an urgency regarding the acceleration, intensity and estimated risk levels of climate change events.</p> <p>7) Regarding Groundwater Protection it requests that the whole area to the north be protected under a combination of objective DB-02 and GC-02.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<p>1)It is proposed to amend the route of U-01 to avoid the pNHA.</p> <p>2)Additional wording is proposed as an amendment Minane Marsh pNHA in Table 4.1.26.</p> <p>3)Noted. This is an operational issue and beyond the remit of the plan.</p> <p>4)Noted. This is an operational issue and is beyond the remit of the plan. U-01 is proposed to be amended to avoid the SPA.</p> <p>5) The areas of woodland and other habitats of biodiversity value referenced lie outside the settlement boundary of the village. Objective BE 15-2 (a) is intended to provide protection to protected sites and sites proposed for protection (including Minane Bridge pNHA) and Objective BE 15-2 (c) is intended to provide protection to habitats of high natural value outside protected sites.</p> <p>6) Noted. Section 11.1 Flooding in Chapter 11 Water Management addresses this issue. The Councils policy on applying the Flood Guidelines are also be set out in this chapter.</p> <p>7) Noted. Section 11.1 Flooding in Chapter 11 Water Management addresses this issue. The Councils policy on applying the Flood Guidelines are also be set out in this chapter.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b></p>	<p>8. See amendment 4.1.10.1.</p> <p>9. See amendment 4.1.10.2.</p> <p>10. No amendment required.</p> <p>11. No amendment required.</p> <p>12. No amendment required.</p> <p>13. No amendment required.</p> <p>14. No amendment required.</p>



<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Trish Lee</b>
<b>DCDP345611792</b>	DCDP345611792
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>University College Cork</b>
<b>DCDP345457609</b>	DCDP345457609
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission regards a site in Ringaskiddy that is approximately 6.174ha in area, and that forms part of the lands zoned RY-I-09 in the draft Plan which has a specific zoning objective that makes provision for the extension of the adjacent Third Level Educational Campus. It states this submission is made in the context of various objectives and strategic goals of international, national, regional and local planning and policy, and continues to list them, such as the UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) launch of the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development (2021-2030). It submitted that the draft site-specific zoning objective RY-I-19, in supporting the development of third level marine-related education and research uses at the subject site, is the most appropriate and logical zoning objective, which will facilitate the future proper orderly and sustainable development of the location and lists reasons why, for example: there is an existing cluster of similar uses in the immediate vicinity, and the site's waterfront location is the most appropriate setting for high-quality, industry-focused marine-related education, research and development. The submission requests the Council retain the zoning objective RY-I-19

	<p>which supports industrial and marine-related third level educational, research and enterprise uses, in respect of a site in Haulbowline Road, Loughbeg, Ringaskiddy, which is located immediately east and south of UCC's ERI Beaufort Building, in the new Cork County Development Plan. It states the draft zoning objective is also consistent with the UCC's strategy for marine education, with the strategic goals of UCC's Strategic Plan 2017-2022, and with the strategic aims of UCC's Sustainability Strategy 2016 which are discussed in detail in the submission.</p> <p>It states the objective is to ensure a continued coherent form of land use at the subject location in order to support, sustain and enhance the existing cluster of marine-related educational and research facilities adjacent to the site, which are a vital strategic part of the region's economy and competitiveness into the future.</p> <p>The submission provides a site location analysis and description of the site. The submission includes images and maps to illustrate. The site is located in Cork Harbour inside the north-eastern corner of the settlement boundary of Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork. It states Rocky Island and Haulbowline Island lie within 520m north of the site, while Spike Island lies less than 650m to the east.</p> <p>It outlines Ringaskiddy's role from a high level documentation perspective, referencing the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), CDP 2014, Ballincollig Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, and Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021.</p> <p>It states the submission is framed in the context of the national, regional and local policies, and continues to list the key aspects, such as enhanced general engagement of the sea by Irish society is encouraged.</p> <p>It states UCC fully supports Cork County Council's zoning objective for the subject site and states it is committed to the further development of such uses on the subject site. The submission outlines a planning history of the site.</p> <p>It states UCC long term objectives are to develop additional buildings on the subject site which will support complementary activities to those currently housed in the ERI Beaufort Building, and that it is anticipated that expansion of up to three times the current footprint of ERI Beaufort Building may be required by the MaREI Centre for future expansion in Ringaskiddy whilst NMCI has medium term plans to expand its training and education facilities to include an additional sea survival and offshore renewable energy training centre and an advanced simulation centre for further education.</p> <p>It states UCC respectfully asks Cork County Council to retain the zoning objective for the subject site and outlines reasons as to why, such as the fact that no other site in the immediate vicinity can facilitate the expansion of this cluster and the planned enhancement of sustainable transportation connectivity provision for Ringaskiddy, which complement UCC's own sustainable travel strategic aims.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests to retain the zoning RY-I-19 in Ringaskiddy and outlines their intent to develop the site.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Objective RY-I-19 will be retained with the County Development Plan, and is deemed suitable for the extension of the adjacent Third Level Educational

	Campus and enterprise related development including marine related education, enterprise, research and development. Consideration will also be given to established operators in Ringaskiddy for the provision of ancillary office accommodation and for Research and Development facilities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Valerie Cummins</b>
<b>DCDP345247974</b>	DCDP345247974
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission states it would like to keep the pathways open for the community as it would benefit the submitter personally and greater society in general. It states these paths have been around for a long time and recently a path behind drakes point was lost. It states it was a massive loss to everyone, and it was a disgrace to lose it after approximately 250 years.</p> <p>It states these paths improve the health and well-being of the people who use them, as it provides safe pedestrian access in rural areas that otherwise lack it. It states it enables people to participate in and enjoy the rural environment and economically benefits the area.</p> <p>The submission requests the area up Church Bay/Templebreedy/by the old golf course to allow picnicing areas in the parking area currently not being used. It notes there are no places for these type of holiday makers (day trippers/elderly/people with disabilities) where they can see the sea view without getting out of the car and have a picnic bench to put their food on.</p> <p>It requests no more large housing estates without infrastructure. It states there is no water treatment plant and raw sewage is flowing into the sea where people are swimming.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests the protection and inclusion of walkways in Crosshaven and Bays.</li> <li>2. Requests the area up Church Bay/Templebreedy/by the old golf course to allow picnicing areas in the parking area currently not being used. It notes there are no places for these type of holiday makers.</li> <li>3. It requests no more large housing estates without infrastructure. It states there is no water treatment plant and raw sewage is flowing into the sea where people are swimming.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan supports indicative and long-established walkways.</li> <li>2. Paragraph 1.6.30 in Volume 4, Chapter 1 Carrigaline Municipal District outlines No additional development shall take place on the lands within the development boundary that are located at the southern end of a ribbon of development and lie to the west of the access road to Templebreedy Fort until such time as a car park and picnic area are provided on these lands.</li> <li>3. Noted. CS-GO-07 addresses this issue, stating the council is supportive of the objective to seek an extension of the Crosshaven</li> </ol>

	<p>public sewer network to serve the Graball area. Any new development should be accompanied by surface water attenuation solutions on site.</p> <p>The Planning Authority cannot deliver the vision for the County set out in this plan in isolation, as Public Transport, National Roads, Water Services and other funding mechanisms are all largely outside the control of local authorities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Wtodlimierz Ksiazek</b>
<b>DCDP345916478</b>	DCDP345916478
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the 47 acres of parkland to the west of the Novartis manufacturing site be designated as Green Infrastructure, as a result of its ecological, visual and amenity value in an area predominantly zoned for industry. It references the conditions imposed on the planning permission for the development of the Novartis complex regarding the parkland, including retaining the area to the west of the manufacturing buildings free from development as a buffer zone between the buildings and the residential homes and the landscaping and maintenance of this buffer zone. It states that when planning permission was being sought, the commitment given to An Bord Pleanála was that these 47 acres would be well-planted parkland forming a wildlife corridor that would enhance the ecological value of the site and provide a recreational space for employees. It notes there is a real deficit of passive open space within comfortable walking distance for residents of Shanbally and Coolmore, and that the 47 acres are critical for this purpose.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests 47 acres of the Novartis site be zoned as Green Infrastructure to protect the ecologically valuable site which is a heavily utilised public amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan supports long established green infrastructure in the county and encourages their protection as environmentally important sites and their use as public amenities. Amendment required to zone the subject site as Green Infrastructure and include a new zoning objective RY-GR-16 in Table 4.1.16 in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See amendment No. 4.1.5.4.

Volume Four -South Cork – Cobh Municipal District.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>A. Aherne</b>
<b>DCDP346287485</b>	DCDP346287485
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Considers that climate change and biodiversity losses are the greatest threats to our survival on this planet and that measures are taken to reduce these need to be at the forefront of the plan.</p> <p>In this context, sets out suggestions for Great Island including the following travel related considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-provide safe active travel opportunities: connect Cobh with Carrigtwohill, Ringaskiddy and Little Island, enhance safety of route to Fota Arboretum and provide secure bike parks at same, provide more walking routes on Great Island and promote the 21 ditches walk, consider a pedestrian priority zone at Cuskinny Marsh Nature Reserve.</li> <li>-coordinate park and ride provision with recreational parks countywide;</li> <li>-enforce traffic speeds;</li> <li>-promote use of good road manners by cyclists;</li> <li>-encourage car sharing;</li> <li>-points to efficiency of ebikes;</li> <li>-consider alternative to proposed new road.</li> </ul> <p>Makes a number of comments and suggestions in relation to biodiversity and heritage including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-highlights importance of mudflat bird habitats adjoining the shore;</li> <li>-asks that residential use 'above the shop' be promoted and that planning permissions in greenbelt areas not be granted;</li> <li>- reduce light pollution;</li> <li>- encourage planting of native trees;</li> <li>- protect hedgerows and control hedge cutting;</li> <li>- introduce building measures to help declining numbers of swifts;</li> <li>- phase out use of herbicides;</li> <li>- Cork County Council should sign up to All Ireland Pollinator Plan;</li> <li>- there should be greater allotment provision on Great Island.</li> <li>- asks that assistance be provided in setting up a Community Supported Agriculture Scheme with local growers and farmers.</li> <li>- In the context of waste, asks for support in helping to set up a kerbside collection scheme for large items.</li> <li>- Care to be taken of old stone wall and buildings when carrying out road works</li> </ul> <p>Also raises the issue of negative and positive consequences of cruise liners in Cobh, making reference to pollution and congestion. Raises concerns regarding drinking water and flooding.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to reduce traffic through the provision of safe walking and cycling opportunities.</li> <li>2. What additional measures can the plan include to promote active travel?</li> <li>3. What alternatives are there to the proposed new road?</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Positive and negative consequences of the cruise liner industry (reference to pollution and congestion)?</p> <p>5. Who is accountable in industries regarding environmental impacts?</p> <p>6. Issues of flooding on Great Island and infill of wetlands.</p> <p>7. Importance of protecting the SAC and SPA.</p> <p>8. Promotion of living over the shop.</p> <p>9. Issue of light pollution.</p> <p>10. Need to plant native trees and protect wild areas.</p> <p>11. Measures to help declining numbers of swifts.</p> <p>12. Protection of hedgerows.</p> <p>13. The use of herbicides by the County Council and their contractors should be phased out.</p> <p>14. Cork County Council should join Cork City Council as a partner in the All – Ireland pollinator plan.</p> <p>15. More opportunities for people to have an allotment on the island. Help set up a Community Supported Agriculture Scheme with local growers and farmers.</p> <p>16. Care to be taken, when the council or its contractors are carrying out road works, around old stone walls and buildings to avoid damaging same.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are a number of objectives in the Draft Plan to promote sustainable transport, including walking and cycling, and to facilitate delivery of the 10 minute town concept - see in particular objectives TM12-1, and TM 12-2. The Cobh Public Realm Enhancement Plan, supported by the Draft Plan, will aid delivery of the 10 minute town.</li> <li>2. There are a number of proposed amendments of relevance – see NO. 1.12.6, NO. 1.12.7, NO. 1.12.8, NO. 1.12.9, NO. 1.12.14, NO. 1.12.15, NO. 1.12.16, NO. 1.12.18, NO. 1.12.24, NO. 1.12.25, 1.12.26, NO. 1.12.33, NO. 1.12.35, NO. 1.12.36, NO. 1.12.37, NO. 1.12.41, NO. 1.12.42, NO. 1.12.48, NO. 1.12.49, NO. 1.12.50, NO. 1.12.54, NO. 1.12.55, Volume2, Part 1, Transport.</li> <li>3. As above, the Draft Plan promotes sustainable transport and contains objectives to promote active travel (TM 12-2), and to promote rail and bus transport (TM 12-3 and TM 12-5), including the delivery of a new rail station at Ballynoe. The Regional Spatial Economic Strategy for the Southern Region, with which the CDP must align, lists the ‘upgrade of the R624 regional road linking N25 to Marino Point and Cobh as a transport priority for he Cork Metropolitan Area. This upgrade and designation of the road to national status form part of Regional Policy Objective 168 and Cork MASP policy objective 9 of the RSES and it is also listed as a National Enabler in the RSES. Additional text is to proposed to be added to the Transport chapter regarding significant environmental sensitivities and built and archaeological heritage sensitivities at this location - see NO. 1.12.45, NO. 1.12.46, NO. 1.12.47, Volume2, Part 1, Transport.</li> <li>4. Cobh has the only dedicated cruise liner berth in the country and the cruise liner industry is a significant element of the tourism offering of Cobh and is supported by the Draft Plan. The objectives of the Draft Plan to promote sustainable transport will reduce traffic congestion</li> </ol>

	<p>generally. Assessment of positive and negative consequences of the cruiser liner industry is outside the remit of the CDP. The objectives of chapter 15, Biodiversity, of the Draft Plan ensure protection of biodiversity, including from pollution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The issue of accountability in industries with regard to environmental impacts is outside the remit of the CDP.</li> <li>6. Chapter 11 Water Management and Chapter 15 Biodiversity provide for the provision and improvement of water, wastewater, surface water and flood alleviation services as well as the protection and enhancement of biodiversity (including wetland habitats). See also proposed changes to these chapters in Volume 2, Part 1 (NO. 1.11.7, NO 1.15.1, NO. 1.15.6, NO. 1.15.7, NO. 1.15.8, NO. 1.15.9, NO. 1.15.10, NO. 1.15.11, NO. 1.15.12, NO. 1.15.13, NO. 1.15.14, NO. 1.15.16, NO. 1.15.17).</li> <li>7. Objective BE 15-2 protects sites, habitats and species which are designated or proposed for designation under European legislation, National legislation and International Agreements – this includes the SAC and SPA.</li> <li>8. Objective PL 3-2 Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places promotes the use of upper floors of the existing town centre building stock for appropriate uses including residential.</li> <li>9. It is recognised that the unpolluted night sky is a heritage and tourism asset for the County and that work should begin on how best to identify these assets and collate data on these areas with a view to informing policy in this area. Objective BE 15-13(c) seeks to control light pollution and Objective BE 15-13(d) commits to reviewing and updating Cork County Council’s Policy Guidelines for Public Lighting to take account of impacts of public lighting on wildlife. See key issue (light pollution) in Biodiversity and Environment Chapter, Volume 1 of this report. See proposed amendment NO. 1.15.14, NO. 1.15.16.</li> <li>10. Policies in the Plan support biodiversity enhancement and the planting of native trees such as Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. In addition, recommendations are made to strengthen the wording in Objective 15-6(c) and Objective BE15-4(a) to require a majority of native trees and plants in the landscaping of new development and Council projects. See also CH-GO-03 and CH-GO-13 of Volume 4.</li> <li>11. Swifts are specifically recognised in Volume 2 and Volume 6 of the Plan as a Bird Species of Conservation Concern and Special Conservation Significance Occurring in Cork. Objective BE15-2 requires protection to be provided for species listed in Volume 2 of the Plan. The Council’s guidelines Council “Biodiversity and the Planning Process”, referred to in Objective BE 15-6, specifically recommends consideration of bird boxes in developments as part of biodiversity mitigation or enhancement.</li> <li>12. Cork County Council committed to support the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan in July 2021 and accordingly the Roads Division of the Council will comply with the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan Transport Corridors Guidelines with the aim of protecting hedgerows, treelines and roadside verges.</li> </ol>
--	---



	<p>13. The use of insecticides and herbicides is an operational matter (rather than a strategic policy matter for the Development Plan). The Biodiversity Action Plan is the appropriate place to discuss and adopt changes to the Council's 'ways of doing' in terms of on-the-ground maintenance works.</p> <p>14. Cork County Council committed to support the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan in July 2021.</p> <p>15. The policies in the Plan support community engagement in biodiversity initiatives (which would include allotments, local growers support etc.) particularly in Objective BE 15-9 Support for communities and Other Stakeholders. The Plan is also being amended to include a commitment to deliver a new County Biodiversity Action Plan which will provide detail on community actions and operational matters. See Proposed Amendment 1.15.1., Volume 2, Part 1, this report.</p> <p>16. Objective HE 16-13 of chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage, is to protect non-structural elements of built heritage. – this can include masonry walls. HE 16-11 relates to the record of protected structures and seeks the protection of all structures in the County which are of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, social or technical interest.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Implement proposed amendments referenced in response above.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Alan &amp; Lorraine O'Leary</b>
<b>DCDP346285800</b>	DCDP346285800
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to 'Land designated CT-I-01' in Carrigtwohill. Submitters feel that the proposal to zone this land for industrial use would have a hugely negative impact on the local area. States that this is an agricultural area providing a separation between the towns of Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill, and that maintaining this and other rural pockets of land on the outskirts of Cork City should be of paramount importance.</p> <p>States that the proposal would obliterate the rural identity of the area, creating an urban sprawl and bringing many negative effects to the well established local residents, to local amenities, environment and wildlife. Submits that the area is in a prominent hillside location which should be a designated green area.</p> <p>Submits that creating an industrial zone adjacent to the pedestrian and cycling amenity under development would have a detrimental affect on the green-way from both an enjoyment and safety perspective.</p> <p>Points to undeveloped areas within the already industrial zones of Carrigtwohill and Little Island which could be prioritised for industrial development while protecting the existing rural areas of Glounthaune.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Amy Quinlan</b>
<b>DCDP346186196</b>	DCDP346186196
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to CT-I-01 in the Draft Plan. Believes this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Amy Quinlan</b>
<b>DCDP346188070</b>	DCDP346188070
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This is a duplicate of DCDP346186196
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See DCDP346186196
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See DCDP346186196
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See DCDP346186196
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Angela Barrett</b>
<b>DCDP346275770</b>	DCDP346275770
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to lands at Corbally, Ballymore located within the Metropolitan Cork Green Belt in the Draft Plan. Makes reference to objective CS 3-2 of the 2014 CDP regarding village nuclei and the village nuclei status of Ballymore/Walterstown in the 2017 LAP.  Details community services available in Ballymore/Walterstown - recently expanded school, creche, community centre, church, pub - making reference to a well established village community, as well as natural amenities in its vicinity.  States that a small number of houses may be accommodated on submitter's land, fulfilling a small number of the extant significant housing needs.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is a village nucleus designation appropriate for this location?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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 <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ann Forde &amp; Alan Shine</b>
<b>DCDP343860633</b>	DCDP343860633
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission refers to a refusal of permission for a dwelling in a rural area outside Carrignavar. States that as there are no sites for sale in Carrignavar it would not be possible to build within the development boundary of the village. Makes reference to lack of water supply and waste water infrastructure in the village and finds that the need for individual dwellings to provide their own waste water infrastructure is a disincentive to develop within the development boundary. Submits that it would be more sustainable for submitter to build on parent's landholding and provide own water infrastructure. Seeks the removal of the development boundary of Carrignavar as it feels a requirement whereby persons living within the development boundary may only build within that boundary is discriminatory.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is removal of the development boundary from Carrignavar appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The removal of the development boundary from Carrignavar would not result in any change to rural housing policy (as alluded to in submission) but rather would result in rural housing policies being applied to land within the village as well as outside the village. It is considered that Carrignavar can accommodate some level of development and it benefits from a range of services. As such it is not considered appropriate to remove the development boundary from the settlement.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anne, James and Lisa Collins</b>
<b>DCDP345001334</b>	DCDP345001334
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to the CT-RR-01/CT and CT-RR-02 Residential Reserve zonings in Carrigtwohill and expresses concern with this area being changed from medium residential to residential reserve stating that in a time of a housing crisis and shortage of housing it should be kept as medium residential density.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate that CT-RR-01 and CT-RR-02 Residential Reserve zonings be zoned 'residential' rather than residential reserve?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient, less peripheral land zoned for residential development to be delivered in the lifetime of the plan to meet the identified growth target for the settlement. However, as a consequence of a proposed amendment to the Core Strategy CT-RR-01 and CT-RR-02 will be recategorized as 'Long Term Strategic

	and Sustainable Development Sites (Further Additional Provision)'. See Proposed Amendment, NO. 4.2.3.17, NO. 4.2.3.17, Volume 2, Part 2, Chapter 2 Cobh MD and NO 1.2.12, Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend CT-RR-01 and CT-RR-02 to recategorize as 'Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development Sites (Further Additional Provision)'.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Audrey Beazley &amp; Family</b>
<b>DCDP346252869</b>	DCDP346252869
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submitter would like to see the proposals in the Local Area Plan In relation to Ballymore/Walterstown included in the CDP stating that the development boundary of the LAP gives the opportunity for residential development within a controlled area, helps prevent ribbon development and allows for the creation of community and recreational areas within a defined boundary. Submits that the development of community facilities within the boundary has created traffic problems which could be reduced by allowing controlled development within the development boundary. States that there is a strong demand for local housing from families wishing to live close to the school, in turn encouraging walking to school, and that a village development helps secure funding for improved local infrastructure. Adds that there is excellent broadband facilities in the area. Submits that people should be entitled to choose to live in a rural setting.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to reinstate the 2017 LAP provisions for Ballymore Walterstown?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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 <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ballymaloe Foods, Courtstown Park, Little Island, Co. Cork,</b>
<b>DCDP345613621</b>	DCDP345613621
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Seeks amended zoning for eastern portion of LI-X-01 (that was zoned industrial in 2017 LAP) as it feels residential use is not compatible with adjoining, industrial land use at Courtstown Park. Finds that LAP industrial zoning of area within north east of LI-X-01 is more appropriate, and requests that this objective be reinstated. Submits that maintaining the existing industrial zoning objective will improve the consolidated 'Strategic Employment Location' function of the wider area. Sets out strategic location factors pertaining to Little Island and Courtstown Park referencing road and rail connections and existing employment uses in

	<p>Little Island. Makes reference to Seveso Sites at the other (Western ) side of Little Island. Details 25 year operation and current employment level of Ballymaloe Foods at Courtstown.</p> <p>Describes arable land to west of Ballymaloe Foods and details past planning permission for site development works there to facilitate future industrial/warehouse &amp; distribution development (expired) and makes reference to adjoining SHD application.</p> <p>Sets out current national, regional and local planning policy context with reference to employment.</p> <p>Submits that population growth needs will be met within Midleton, Cobh, Carrigtwohill and Monard and that to incorporate additional residential element at Little Island is contrary to established regional and local policies. It submits that the area it is not conducive to a high standard of residential amenity.</p> <p>It suggests that it would be appropriate to provide a transition in scale from 'bad neighbour' land uses such as would be offered by a light industrial use adjoining Ballymaloe Foods, making reference to noise/odour/air emissions arising from uses at Courtstown Park.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is an increased residential offering in Little Island appropriate?</li> <li>2. Is the LI-X-01 zoning, adjoining existing industrial land at Courtstown Park, appropriate?</li> <li>3. Are additional requirements regarding buffering from adjoining industry needed?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In consideration of the level of employment in Little Island and the need to integrate land use and transport planning it is considered appropriate to facilitate an increased residential offering on Little Island and to accommodate this in a single location through a special policy area objective in order to deliver a high quality new residential neighbourhood. The Core Strategy of the plan sets a target a growth target for Little Island which is to be substantially met by this site.</li> <li>2. The extent of the LI-X-01 site is considered appropriate to deliver the objective for the site. The site is to be developed as part of an approved framework plan which will take the adjoining industrial uses into account. It is not envisaged that the LI-X-01 zoning will restrict any existing operations at Courtstown Park.</li> <li>3. The LI-X-01 objective already includes a requirement for appropriate buffering between development and the adjoining industrial use.</li> </ol> <p>See proposed amendments to LI-X-01 in relation to the wording of the objective – volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island. NO. 4.2.5.8, NO. 4.2.5.9, NO. 4.2.5.12.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed in relation to submission request however see proposed amendments to LI-X-01 in relation to the wording of the objective.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ballymore Community Association</b>
<b>DCDP345762118</b>	DCDP345762118
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Emphasises the rural nature of the Ballymore area and environs. Feels that, given the lack of infrastructure in the area in terms of drinking water and waste water treatment, the area is not appropriate for any large scale housing development or zoning.

	<p>Proposes the inclusion in the Plan of provision of a nature based walkway parallel to the Cuskinny marsh as an environmental amenity in the area.</p> <p>Comments on a number of section 11 submissions submitted to the Plan review process include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- states that a large scale proposal for development of 13 sites is not appropriate for Ballymore,</li> <li>- states that the site adjoining Ballymore church is an ideal location for a necessary car park for the church.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identification of walkways and of land for community use in rural areas.</li> <li>2. Inappropriateness of large scale development of zoning in areas lacking water services.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan identifies walkways in settlements and also supports particular cycleways/greenways of strategic importance. The identification of additional specific amenity walkways etc. outside of settlements is outside the remit of the CDP. Chapter 10, Tourism and Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility strongly support walking and active travel generally. The issue of identifying an area for a car park, outside of a settlement, is outside the remit of the CDP.</li> <li>2. It is noted that it is submitted that the area is not appropriate for any large scale housing development or zoning due to lack of services. The area does not feature within the County's settlement network, having been removed from same in the draft plan, and as such there are no lands zoned in the area.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Barlow Properties Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345949097</b>	DCDP345949097
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests an extension to zoning objective GN-R-01 in Glounthaune to include the entirety of the site of Ashbourne House &amp; Gardens, a Protected Structure to secure the conservation of the historic bog garden and a number of trees in particular. The submission provides detailed planning policy context, planning history and rationale for the request.</p> <p>The increased residential density prescribed for Glounthaune and the site is welcomed and considered appropriate.</p> <p>It is requested that the split zonings on The Ashbourne House &amp; Gardens be revised to a single zoning i.e. that the site-specific residential zoning objective GN-R-01 Ashbourne House and Gardens, be extended to include the eastern portion of lands zoned 'existing residential'. This is to ensure the integrity of the heritage value of the entire site of Ashbourne House and Gardens is protected and that a coherent pattern of land-use and development occurs on the site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	GN-R-01 to be extended to include all Ashbourne House & Gardens as per submission subject site.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The objective for this site includes a reference to the significant existing woodland setting and requires protection of the character and biodiversity value as much as possible particularly through retention of trees. As the submission subject site includes additional land, also of significant biodiversity value, that is part of Ashbourne House and Gardens, it is considered that inclusion of this additional land within the zoning will facilitate the development of a more coherent plan in relation to the woodland habitat. See also additional proposed amendment which relates to an increased density, a reduced net housing area, provision of community/recreation facility and a strengthened requirement for protection of trees. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend area of GN-R-01 to include additional land identified as being within the Ashbourne House and Garden landholding to facilitate an integrated approach to the protection of the trees.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bertie &amp; Denis O'Flaherty</b>
<b>DCDP346150569</b>	DCDP346150569
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to land to the north of Watergrasshill, outside of and adjoining the village development boundary. Submits that the 14.5 acre site is within the 50kph speed limit, slopes towards the sewage plant and would be suitable for housing. See also similar submission ref. DCDP345775021.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for additional zoned land in Watergrasshill for residential development to meet the growth target for the settlement?</li> <li>2. Is this site the most appropriate location for any additional residential development required?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A revision of the Core Strategy of the Plan has identified a requirement for an additional 59 residential units to be delivered during the lifetime of the plan. Additional zoning is required in Watergrasshill. See proposed amendment relating to alternative land, Volume2, Part 2, Cobh MD</li> <li>2. While it is necessary to identify additional land for residential development it is felt that there is alternative land that is more appropriate for residential development than this land.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bertie O'Flaherty</b>
<b>DCDP345775021</b>	DCDP345775021
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to land to the north of Watergrasshill, outside of and adjoining the village development boundary. Submits that the 14.5 acre site is within the 50kph speed limit, slopes towards the sewage plant and would be suitable for housing. See also related submission ref. DCDP346150569.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See DCDP346150569
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See DCDP346150569
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See DCDP346150569



<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Birdwatch Ireland Cuskinny Marsh Nature Reserve Management Team</b>
<b>DCDP345951224</b>	DCDP345951224
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission seeks pedestrian priority on the road that runs along the western side of the Cuskinny Marsh Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Traffic calming, warning signs, reduced speed limit and footpath/ road markings for pedestrians are requested. The submission details the economic, tourism and amenity benefits in promoting Cuskinny as a pedestrian priority area.</p> <p>The Council is requested to consider a number of proposed walking loops in Cuskinny which are marked on aerial photographs in the submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identification of pedestrian priority on a particular road.</li> <li>2. Identification of walking routes in the County.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan identifies walkways in settlements and also supports particular cycleways/greenways of strategic importance. The identification of additional specific walkways etc. outside of settlements is outside the remit of the CDP. However Chapter 10, Tourism and Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility strongly support walking and active travel generally.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bluescape Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346048258</b>	DCDP346048258
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to lands at Lackenroe, Glounthaune and requests that the development boundary be extended to include the subject lands as per the 2011 and 2017 LAPS. Further they request that the GN-R-04 residential zoning objective be extended to include the subject lands.</p> <p>They consider the extension of the GN-R-04 zoning objective is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They consider that there is no justification for the de-zoning of lands and that it goes against the recommendations of the Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR) and the Southern Regional Authority (SRA) in their submissions to the Draft CDP Issues and Options Paper. The proposed de-zoning is at variance with national and regional policies contained within the National Planning Framework (NPF) and Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES) which refer to the need to facilitate the '10-minute town concept'.</li> <li>• They note that the extension of the GN-R-04 zoning objective is consistent with the core strategy of the Draft CDP which actively promotes future development around high frequency public transport links and where there is infrastructure in place to accommodate development.</li> <li>• They note that the housing and population targets for many settlements in the Cobh Municipal District and the county are dependent on the timely delivery of critical infrastructure during the lifetime of the plan. They note the ongoing uncertainty regarding the delivery of this infrastructure. They note that Glounthaune has an existing high frequency rail service and has capacity in the local water infrastructure network to accommodate increased levels of</li> </ul>

	<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They consider having reviewed recent planning activity in Glounthaune that there are insufficient lands zoned for residential development in the draft CDP to accommodate the required growth of the settlement. This results in their view in an over reliance on the delivery of other lands in the settlement which have been zoned for development since 2005 and have not yet come forward.</li> <li>• They no longer consider Glounthaune’s status as a ‘key village’ settlement in the settlement hierarchy of the Draft CDP to be appropriate given its location on a public transport corridor.</li> <li>• They are actively seeking to deliver residential development at the subject site through the Strategic Housing Development (SHD) process.</li> <li>• They note that Irish Water have confirmed availability of infrastructure and have submitted details of this as an appendix to their submission.</li> <li>• They note that the subject sites include proposed connectivity to the south is supported by significant infrastructural investment.</li> <li>• They consider that the de-zoning of the subject lands would result in a ‘hollowing out’ of the natural built footprint of Glounthaune and contribute to an undesirable pattern of development for the settlement.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it necessary to expand the development boundary of Glounthaune?</li> <li>2. Is a key village designation appropriate for this settlement?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is sufficient land zoned for residential development in Glounthaune to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan. National and regional planning policies, regarding compact growth, integrated land use and transport planning, implementation of the ten-minute town concept, etc. have informed the zoning approach to Glounthaune. Of the sites zoned for residential development in Glounthaune, two of these are currently under construction and the other two are located close to the rail station and benefit from good pedestrian/cycle connectivity to same and to the village centre. The submission subject lands, outside the development boundary are more peripheral and are quite elevated and visually prominent.</li> <li>2. Glounthaune recorded a 2016 census population of close to 1,500 and has seen more recent population growth. While it benefits from water services it does not benefit from the wider range of services that would be expected in a Metropolitan Town to support significant population growth such as employment or retail, etc. While provision has been made for the development of community facilities these are currently lacking in the settlement. The ‘Key Village’ status identified for Glounthaune in the settlement hierarchy of the plan is considered appropriate.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Boyd Barrett Murphy O'Connor Architects</b>
<b>DCDP343554474</b>	DCDP343554474
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to a 8.5Ha site within the development boundary of Whitechurch and seeks stronger housing and population projections for

	<p>Whitechurch, designation of Whitechurch as a Key Village, introduction of text allowing for additional development within villages that have benefited from significant investment in infrastructure, and provision for the transfer of development allocation between settlements within the same area where one settlement is under-performing and the other is constrained by the allocation.</p> <p>Sets out site description and context - proximity of village to city and N20, proximity of site to amenities, availability of bus service, significant investment in settlement's infrastructure, particular water supply and wastewater infrastructure. Sets out proposals and sketch of development envisaged for site.</p> <p>Sets out planning policy context including national growth targets and compact growth objectives, RSES identification of rural towns and villages as local drivers for surrounding areas, 2014 CDP policy, 2017 LAP policy for Whitechurch.</p> <p>Submits a rationale including the following: site is fully serviceable and available, need for housing development to deliver Draft CDP for Whitechurch, recent, significant water infrastructure investment, range of community facilities and availability of bus service. Compares Whitechurch to other settlements in terms of growth and services. Submits that future zoning should prioritise areas which consolidate existing and permitted developments in line with NPF and RSES principles.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is a stronger housing and population projection for Whitechurch appropriate?</li> <li>2. Is a key village designation appropriate for Whitechurch?</li> <li>3. Provision for the transfer of development allocation between settlements within the same area where one settlement is underperforming and the other is constrained by the allocation.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notwithstanding the water services infrastructural capacity of Whitechurch, the level of growth allocated is considered to be in keeping with the existing scale and character of the village, and the level of local services and facilities, including public transport provision.</li> <li>2. It is also considered that the 'village' settlement designation is more appropriate than a key village given the the level of local services and facilities, including public transport provision.</li> <li>3. It is proposed to amend the text of the Cobh MD regarding Key Villages to reference that Council will consider the reallocation of the overall level of units for a specific Key Village from Key Villages with infrastructure constraints that are taking longer than expected to be resolved to a Key Village or Key Villages within the same Municipal District which has no such constraints subject to adequate capacity been shown to be available, in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 11 Water Management and any ecological considerations. It will also state that increase in the re-allocation of housing units must not exceed 50% of the allocation set out in the table below. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.12.A, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Key Villages.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Cobh MD text regarding Key Villages as recommended above.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Breda Stack</b>
<b>DCDP343878560</b>	DCDP343878560
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Supports the zoning for the provision of community facilities in Glounthaune in the Draft CDP (GN-C-01) and the recognition of the need for sports facilities, and is particularly appreciative of the provision for expansion of the school. States that the area is car dependent and additional traffic would damage the Lackenroe 'Dry Bridge'. States that developing the lower levels near the village and public transport is better than developing elevated areas. In relation to objective GN-C-02 it notes the proposed protection of ecological habitats in the Draft Plan. It expresses appreciation for the cycleway currently being developed.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports objective GN-C-01,</li> <li>2. Supports the concept of residential zonings close to rail and at lower elevations.</li> <li>3. Notes reference in objective GN-C-02 to ecological habitats.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GN-C-01, for the provision of community facilities, is considered necessary and appropriate given the existing level of facilities in the settlement and the level of recent and planned growth. The support for GN-C-01 in the submission is noted.</li> <li>2. Support for the concept of residential zonings close to rail and at lower elevations is noted.</li> <li>3. Noted – it is important to reference the need to protect these significant ecological habitats which overlap/adjoin the zoned area.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brenda Cummins</b>
<b>DCDP345762944</b>	DCDP345762944
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to a 0.237 Ha site located in the Metropolitan Greenbelt outside Glounthaune and adjoined by a ribbon of 4 dwellings to the north and south. Requests that the development boundary of Glounthaune is extended to include subject site and adjoining and nearby residences.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is an amendment to the development boundary of Glounthaune required?</li> <li>2. Is the subject land more suitable for development than land currently within the development boundary of Glounthaune.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is sufficient land within the development boundary of Glounthaune for the growth target identified in the Core Strategy. Any application to develop the infill site as per the submission will be subject to the rural housing policy of the Plan. As outlined in the Draft Plan, new guidelines on rural housing are awaited and are expected in Q4 2021. The plan will be varied as necessary to comply with the updated Guidelines. See discussion in relation to Chapter 5 Rural Volume One Part One of this report dealing with Key Issues, Responses and Recommendations.</li> <li>1. The zoned land in Glounthaune is more appropriately located than the subject site.</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Caitriona Power</b>
<b>DCDP346272391</b>	DCDP346272391
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land in Carrigtwohill zoned CT-I-01 in the Draft Plan. Submitter strongly objects to the proposed change of land use for this area stating that it is an entirely wrong designation for this land area particularly given the already excessively zoned areas in immediate vicinities of Carrigtwohill and Little Island.</p> <p>With reference to the newly installed Greenway link from Cork-Carrigtwohill immediately adjacent to this land it states that an industrially zoned area in this vicinity makes absolutely zero sense from a practical, sustainable and safety perspective.</p> <p>Urges the council to rethink this designation and to instead continue with a more sustainable, green thinking for the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carmel Ryan</b>
<b>DCDP344621703</b>	DCDP344621703
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that a 1.76Ha site in the Metropolitan Greenbelt, containing the Elm Tree bar/restaurant be included within the development boundary of Carrigtwohill and zoned as 'Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses', in keeping with existing developed area and optimising recent infrastructure investments in the area.</p> <p>It states that while the subject area is currently zoned as the Metropolitan Greenbelt under the Draft Plan it is not greenbelt, as defined in the Draft Plan, forming part of the built-up area which includes a mix of uses including a long-established bar/restaurant and an offices / compound of a general building contractor.</p> <p>Outlines that the area has just benefited from a significant level of investment with the provision of the new pedestrian/cycle route planned from Bury's Bridge to Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>Sets out locational context of site – proximity to Carrigtwohill and Glounthaune, to train stations, and to business and industry to the east; north of former N25 and rail line; new pedestrian/cycleway runs directly past site. States that site is surrounded by a mix of uses.</p> <p>Sets out Planning Policy including national growth targets, reference to RSES, 2014 CDP objectives relating to Metropolitan Greenbelt and to Existing Built Up Areas, Draft CDP objectives relating to Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses.</p> <p>Outlines rationale for the request including long established business adjoining development boundary of Carrigtwohill, excellent transport connections,</p>

	perceived conflict between Draft CDP greenbelt status of land and current use of land.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the exclusion of the existing business and its backland area from the Metropolitan Greenbelt necessary and appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site is located within the County Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt an objective of which is to prevent coalescence of built up areas and to focus attention on lands within settlements which are zoned for development. Exclusion of the proposed site from the greenbelt would erode the greenbelt gap between Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill. There is sufficient employment land zoned in Carrigtwohill and Little Island. Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to exclude the subject lands from the greenbelt.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carol Harpur</b>
<b>DCDP346258179</b>	DCDP346258179
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Welcomes the proposed plan put forward for Glounthaune village stating that directing the future growth of the village in this way should create a more compact settlement in line with Ireland 2040. Proposes the inclusion of the following objectives to support the 10-minute town concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to encourage additional retail and services including childcare services within the village to meet the needs of the growing community.</li> <li>- to work with the community to increase the provision of community facilities and amenities to adequately cater for the existing and future residents, including the delivery of a community/sports hall.</li> <li>- to promote a safe pedestrian environment to support active travel to school and encourage smarter travel patterns, including measures around the school and Terrace Road.</li> </ul> <p>Submits that it is also important to change the objective GN-R-01 to support the 10 minute city/town concept in the RSES: Enhancing the quality of our existing places through retrofitting a high standard of infrastructure, services and amenities that improve the liveability and quality of place in existing settlements and communities, especially locations that experienced significant new population growth in the past. Proposes GN-R-01 Medium A density residential and mixed use development to contribute to a 10 minute town concept and improve liveability and quality of place in the settlement.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do the existing policies in volume 1 adequately support the 10 minute town and is there a need to zone land for additional uses, such as retail and childcare services to support delivery of the 10 minute town?</li> <li>2. Is the GN-R-01 more suitable to a mixed use development to t to contribute to a 10 minute town concept and improve liveability and quality of place in the settlement?</li> <li>3. How can the plan promote a safe pedestrian environment to support active travel to school and encourage smarter travel patterns, including measures around the school and Terrace Road?</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Can the CDP include an objective to work with the community to increase the provision of community facilities and amenities to adequately cater for the existing and future residents, including the delivery of a community/sports hall?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility, contains a number of objectives that strongly supports the 10 minute town concept. This is also supported in Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking. The GN-C-01 objective for Glounthaune is located beside the school to allow for the expansion of the school and also the provision of additional required community facilities for the village close to the school – this clustering of community uses will support the promotion of active travel. Childcare services may also be located on land zoned for residential development. There is some scope for small scale residential development within the GN-T-01 zoning, proximate to a significant amount of existing and planned residential development and connected to GN-R-01, GN-R-02 and GN-R-03 by the new cycleway.</p> <p>2. It is proposed to reduce the approximate net developable area of the GN-R-01 zoning to reflect the significance of the wooded gardens around Ashbourne House. It is also proposed to strengthen the requirement for protection of the trees in the objective of the site. Given the need to protect the trees and the corresponding appropriate net housing area the site has limited potential for a mix of uses. It is considered however that the site has the potential to provide a small scale community or recreation use which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. This will assist in delivering the 10 minute town concept. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD.</p> <p>3. Objective TM 12-2 of Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility, is a comprehensive objective to promote active travel including to schools. It is also proposed to include additional objectives in the plan supporting the Safe Schools Scheme and supporting the principle of reduced vehicular speeds in settlements. See proposed amendment, NO. 1.12.50, Volume 2, Part 1, Transport and Mobility.</p> <p>4. Objectives SC 6-1 Social and Community Infrastructure Provision and SC 6-2 Social and Community Engagement support the approach of working with communities to deliver the community services they require. Amendment No. 1.6.3, volume 2, part 1.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend GN-R-01 to afford greater protection to trees and to provide a small scale community or recreation use.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carol Harpur</b>
<b>DCDP345955038</b>	DCDP345955038
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>There is over-zoning of land for Industrial use in Carrigtwohill. The removal of land zoned CT-I-01 in the LAP is supported. Sufficient industrial land is already zoned in Little Island , Carrigtwohill IDA park, Tullagreen and at the former 'Amgen' site at Ballyadam which is fully serviced.</p> <p>The strategic greenbelt gap between Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill needs to be preserved and protected. The Carrigtwohill settlement boundary should</p>



	stop at the Springhill road at Killacloyne as previously drawn. In the interest of balanced development throughout the county, consideration should be given to dispersing the industrial zoned land to other areas of the county.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carraig na bhFear Community Council Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345680115</b>	DCDP345680115
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Calls on Irish Water to prioritise Carrignavar WWTP for funding to upgrade and increase capacity. States that the village has great development potential with proximity to Cork City and that the village has a Primary and Secondary school, and great amenities.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The need for waste water services in Carrignavar to accommodate more development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Draft Plan recognises the need for a WWTP in Carrignavar. The level of growth identified for Carrignavar in the Core Strategy reflects the absence of adequate waste water services. The provision of same is within the remit of Irish Water. Irish Water have not indicated that such services will be provided within the lifetime of the CDP. See key issue, Chapter 11 Water Management.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carraig-na-bhFear Community Council Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345474898</b>	DCDP345474898
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that an upgrade of the waste water treatment plant in Carrignavar is the only option to allow any development in the community. States that the village has opportunity for growth and development to become a viable commuter location for Cork City. Submits that lack of development will impact on other community services: new primary school will not be adequately utilised, site of current school will become disused and unsightly, the potential development of a community complex adjacent to the new school will require considerable community investment in a private waste water treatment facility, lack of adequate public waste water facilities is an unnecessary added expense to private new builds. The submission is in the form of a petition with approximately 34 pages of signatures.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The need for waste water services in Carrignavar to accommodate more development.</li> <li>2. Redevelopment of former school site.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Draft Plan recognises the need for a WWTP in Carrignavar. The level of growth identified for Carrignavar in the Core Strategy reflects the absence of adequate waste water services. The provision of same is within the remit of Irish Water. Irish Water have not indicated that</li> </ol>

	<p>such services will be provided within the lifetime of the CDP. See key issue, Volume 1, Chapter Water Management.</p> <p>2. Proposals for the site will be assessed on their merits as part of the development management process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carrig Partnership and Ruden Homes Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP346046009</b>	DCDP346046009
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Supports the proposed zoning of the site as residential, however, the requirement to provide a framework plan for the entire site is restrictive in terms of bringing the site forward and the draft plan lacks clear guidance on how this will be achieved. Considers that the proposed population growth of 1,051 persons for Little Island does not support the need for a school and a neighbourhood centre. They request that the Plan change the zoning of the site from Special Policy Area LI-X-01 to Residential. Considers there is no evidence of the site being used for bird species referred to in the draft zoning objective for the site.</p> <p>The submission refers to the relevant policies of the CDP (2014), and the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS).</p> <p>Framework Policy Restrictions – Regarding objective requirement for a framework plan, they state that the zoned site is in two parcels which are within different ownership. They note that both parties are working in isolation and the likelihood of a collaborative approach required to deliver a framework / masterplan is unlikely given they had previously objected to a planning application.</p> <p>They consider that there are no barriers to the delivery of housing on the site given it is a serviced site and in a sustainable location. Refers to a recent appeal decision (ABP-304271-19) which echoes this view. They consider that the only barrier to delivery is the requirement for a framework plan.</p> <p>They consider that the population growth for Little Island does not support the need for a neighbourhood centre and a school and that the requirement for public open space and high-quality public realm can be addressed via a planning application.</p> <p>They note that we are not aware of any evidence of the site being used by the species referred to in the draft zoning objective and any potential impact would be addressed when the AA screening is carried out at planning application stage.</p> <p>They consider that an infrastructure framework plan is a viable solution to facilitating the sustainable delivery of housing on these lands and the need for an overall masterplan is not justified and would only inhibit delivery of residential development.</p> <p>Need for Social Infrastructure – Considers that the site is supported by a strong network of local services and amenities and that there is sufficient capacity within the surrounding area to accommodate the demand for school places within the lifetime of the draft Development Plan. Reference is made to the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (SRDUA) Guidelines. They also consider that the projected population growth would not viably support a new neighbourhood centre on the subject lands. Reference is made to the approach in the Cork City Council Development Plan regarding neighbourhood</p>

	<p>centres.</p> <p>Ecology – Considers that the proposed wording for the objective relates to the adjoining site to the east (LI-I-02) and particularly the southern part of those lands. An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report supports the current SHD and they note that the previous application (18/6021 and ABP-304271-19), that the Appropriate Assessment screened out any potential impacts on the SPA.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the planned population growth for Little Island give rise to additional educational facility requirements?</li> <li>2. Is it appropriate to require a neighbourhood centre within the LI-X-01 zoning?</li> <li>3. Is it necessary to reference, in the specific objective for the site, that part of the site is known to be an important feeding location for a number of species of bird for which the Cork Harbour SPA is designated?</li> <li>4. Is the requirement in the specific objective for the development of the site to be subject to an approved framework plan justified?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department of Education, in its submission to the Draft Plan, does not identify a requirement for an additional school in Little Island. Accordingly, it is proposed to remove the requirement for the provision of a school from the LI-X-01 objective wording. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</li> <li>2. The growth target for Little Island is concentrated within the LI-X-01 which is to deliver 500 residential units. In order to allow for this to be developed as a new sustainable residential neighbourhood it is considered necessary to provide a neighbourhood centre to serve the residents. It is envisaged that this would be a small scale, local neighbourhood centre and it is proposed to amend the wording of the objective to clarify this. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</li> <li>3. The site is located in close proximity to the Cork Harbour SPA and it is proposed to amend the wording of the objective so that it is more accurate and is consistent with objectives for other sites also in close proximity to the Cork Harbour SPA. New wording will reflect that areas within it may be used by Special Conservation Interest bird species for which the Cork Harbour SPA is designated and that account will be taken of same when considering new development proposals in this area.</li> <li>4. This large site is to be developed to optimise the potential to create a residential development of almost 500 units which delivers the 10 minute town concept. As such the development is to deliver high quality public open space, public realm, neighbourhood centre and optimal connectivity and it is considered that the potential of the site is best realised through implementation of an agreed framework plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. remove the requirement for the provision of a school from the LI-X-01 objective wording. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</li> <li>2. amend the LI-X-01 objective text to clarify scale of neighbourhood centre required. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. Amend the LI-X-01 objective text in relation to proximity to the SPA - See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carrigtwohill United AFC</b>
<b>DCDP346298836</b>	DCDP346298836
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission supports the CT-GA-09 zoning in the Draft Plan, where the Carrigtwohill United AFC club is located, and wishes for the zoning to be retained.</p> <p>Referencing future residential developments bounding Ballyadam, states that they are willing to engage with landowners and developers regarding improving green infrastructure, sports facilities and connections between existing and future developments and the club and asks that the Council encourage this at pre planning stage.</p> <p>Raises issue of connectivity and opportunity for public lighting and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure to ensure safety of club members.</p> <p>Outlines club history, locational context and club requirements. States that the club is severely constrained by ambiguity surrounding what Council views as the preferred land use for the lands on which it is located. Asks Council to look at a longer term expansion area for the club.</p> <p>Outlines policies from 2014 CDP relating to social and community infrastructure provision and open space, sports, etc. areas. Outlines Draft Plan policies including projected growth for Carrigtwohill, and stresses the importance of ensuring that adequate services are put in place with capacity to grow in tandem with population, with continued growth of CUAFC being key to this.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports CT-GA-09.</li> <li>2. Greater connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists between CT-GA-09 and existing and future developments.</li> <li>3. Is there sufficient land identified in the plan for recreational use in light of the growth target for the town?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. It is agreed that greater connectivity is required for pedestrian and cyclists between CT-GA-09 and existing and future developments. Land is zoned for residential development at CT-R-14 and in addition it is proposed that a small area of CT-GC-06 would be identified as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. It is important that there is pedestrian/cycle connectivity between the town centre, these lands and the existing sports facility at CT-GA-09. It is proposed that a new utility objective would be included in the Plan to upgrade Carrigane Rd to accommodate pedestrian and cycle facilities. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.3.26 and NO. 4.2.3.30, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD of this report.</li> <li>3. There are a number of green infrastructure zonings in Carrigtwohill identified for recreational use comprising existing playing fields as well as proposed parks. Also, community uses, astro pitch and playground are provided for at CT-C-02. These all contribute to the social</li> </ol>

	infrastructure needs of the town. The level of open space that has been zoned is considered to be appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend CT-GC-06 as recommended elsewhere in this report. Amend the Plan to include new objective to upgrade Carrigane Rd to accommodate pedestrian and cycle facilities.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cathal Dorgan</b>
<b>DCDP346259624</b>	DCDP346259624
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submitter raises a concern of a lack of provision for serviced sites in the Glounthaune area stating that he was recently refused planning permission in the Strategic Cork Metropolitan Greenbelt on land in his ownership. States that he does not wish to live in a high density housing estate, submitting that it is the only alternative. Requests the provision of reasonable exceptions to the metropolitan greenbelt that would allow genuine locals to be granted permission to construct their home provided it is within a reasonable distance from their homeplace or they have proved sufficiently that they have been living within the greenbelt for the minimum 7 years prior. Finds it to be unreasonable and unfair to expect people reared in a 'rural area under urban influence' to purchase houses in extremely high density housing estates. States that if people like him cannot be catered for then serviced sites need to be provided for one off housing.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The provision of housing in the Metropolitan Greenbelt.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	As outlined in the Draft Plan, new guidelines on rural housing are awaited and are expected in Q4 2021. The plan will be varied as necessary to comply with the updated Guidelines. See discussion in relation to Chapter 5 Rural Volume One Part One of this report dealing with Key Issues, Responses and Recommendations.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Catherine Kenneally</b>
<b>DCDP345808109</b>	DCDP345808109
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that the Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan greenbelt status be removed in the zoning area that includes land on the east side of the M8 at Richmond, Dunkettle, Glanmire. States that the development of this area has decreased the need for this status.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to remove this land from the Greenbelt ?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The subject site is an undeveloped greenfield site part of which is identified as Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt and all of which is in the Metropolitan Greenbelt Rural Housing Policy type. It is not clear for what purpose the submitter wishes to have the site removed from the greenbelt. As outlined in the Draft Plan, new guidelines on rural housing are awaited and are expected in Q4 2021. The plan will be varied as necessary to comply with the updated Guidelines.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cian Shealy</b>

<b>DCDP345961344</b>	DCDP345961344
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to land to the south of CH-R-16, identified as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>States that the plan does not include for the future green infrastructure (full size GAA pitch) located to the south of CH-R-16, to be provided as part of the approved planning application by Mijos Development Limited at Cooline, Ballyvoloon.</p> <p>Submits an extract from planning conditions attached to an application which requires a full sized replacement playing pitch to be provided.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of replacement leisure and recreational facilities where former facilities are redeveloped for another use.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Objective GI 14-5: Replacement/Redevelopment of Leisure and Recreational Facilities, of the Draft Plan, provides for the protection and improvement of existing areas of public and private open space, including sports grounds, or other recreational facilities in accordance with the Council's Recreation and Amenity Policy and any successor policy, and the protection of such areas from development or change of use. It outlines requirements that must be clearly demonstrated where changes of use or redevelopment of existing leisure or recreational facilities are proposed.</p> <p>In relation to this particular site, Phase 5 of the permitted development is currently under construction and it is expected that the pitch will form part of the development of Phase 7.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ciara Kelly</b>
<b>DCDP346190906</b>	DCDP346190906
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission would appear to relate to CT-I-01.</p> <p>Believes this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Claire Casey</b>
<b>DCDP346295667</b>	DCDP346295667
<b>Submission Summary</b>	States that there are many positive aspects to the draft LAP for Glounthaune and that it is appropriate that additional land has been zoned for community and amenity purposes and that the blanket zoning for residential has been removed.

Principal Issues Raised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for approach to Glounthaune in Draft Plan.</li> <li>2. Support for community and amenity zonings.</li> <li>3. Support for zoning approach to residential development.</li> </ol>
Chief Executive's Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted. See also proposed amendment to GN-R-01. Proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO. 4.2.8.3, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> </ol>
Chief Executive's Recommendation	Amend GN-R-01 as per Proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO. 4.2.8.3
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Claire Dunne</b>
<b>DCDP346281873</b>	DCDP346281873
Submission Summary	Relates to CT-I-01 zoning in Carrigtwohill. Submitters state that they completely oppose the proposed plan and that it is unnecessary and inappropriate for this particular area. States that Carrigtwohill already has lots of industry and that there is a huge, empty site ripe for development at the Amgen site.
Principal Issues Raised	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
Chief Executive's Response	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr Alan O'Connor</b>
<b>DCDP346171800</b>	DCDP346171800
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Comprehensive submission making a number of comments and suggestions regarding particular aspects of the Cobh MD chapter of the Draft Plan, primarily in relation to sustainable transport and the protection of built heritage and the protection/enhancement of biodiversity. A number of comments made in relation to particular settlements have a more general, countywide relevance. Carrigtwohill:</p> <p>Seeks removal of industrial zoning at CT-I-01 finding that it is excessive and compromises the separate identities of Carrigtwohill and Glounthaune, and raising ecological considerations, and seeks placing of Carrigtwohill settlement boundary east of Killacloyne bridge. Submits that CT-B-01, and CT-B-02 compromise the setting and integrity of the settlement as well as the high value landscape of the general harbour area.</p> <p>Suggests additional wording in relation to parking and development within the town centre, including regeneration sites, to advance the goal of modal shift.</p> <p>Suggests clarification to Table 4.2.7 regarding active travel and access to individual dwellings within the UEA.</p> <p>In the context of road upgrades and concern for built heritage, submits that it may be worthwhile re-iterating the user prioritisation (car, pedestrian etc.) in the context of proposed changes which may affect Carrigtwohill's historic fabric.</p> <p>Seeks the inclusion of text regarding the integrity of CT-GC-07 and CT-GC-08,</p>



	<p>and regarding how the 'linear park' idea is intended to be incorporated between CT-R-13, CT-R-16, CT-R-17, and CT-U-11. Raises concern that the development of a park may compromise the ecological integrity of CT-GC-07 and CT-GC 08.</p> <p>Seeks the consideration of wording within objective CT-X-01 stating that the station car park may in time provide valuable potential development land, depending on its usage levels.</p> <p>Submits that Carrigtwohill is well-suited and situated for compact, sustainable development but suggests that once the development proposed in the plan is delivered, with the exception of 3 employment zonings mentioned, then no further expansion of the built footprint of Carrigtwohill should occur.</p> <p>Cobh:</p> <p>Seeks an emphasis on investment in transport infrastructure rather than road infrastructure in the local context section of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Seeks additional wording in relation to both the expansion of tourism offering and the CH-X-02 to state that development would be subject to the outcome of the planning process and environmental assessments.</p> <p>Seeks equal amount of zoned lands split between LI-I-01 and LI-GC-01 to more appropriately distribute the weight of human incursion on the natural environment in the area.</p> <p>Seeks additional wording to general objectives for Cobh in relation to permeability, pedestrian and cycle access from the N25 to Cobh, and native tree planting.</p> <p>Seeks acknowledgement of light pollution and commitment to enforcing the sensitive installation and operation of lighting in the harbour, where possible</p> <p>Monard:</p> <p>Seeks inclusion of text regarding the relationship between the 2016 scheme and the NPF's and CDP's ambition towards higher density; seeks text regarding the changing emphasis of transport investment and modal shift; and seeks text regarding the principles of DMURS. Also when and how the scheme will be subject to revision. Asks that the importance of a sensitive approach to existing built heritage be included.</p> <p>Glounthaune:</p> <p>Seeks rewriting of reference to trees around Ashbourne House with reference to 69 of them being on the Tree Council of Ireland's register of important trees.</p> <p>Seeks wording to clarify that U-01 is for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Watergrasshill:</p> <p>Seeks reference to Meenane protected groundwater source, seeks rewording of WT-GC-01 to allow for sensitive provision for amenity area etc.</p> <p>Fota: seeks wording regarding disabled access to station.</p> <p>Seeks a number of additional clarifications.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p><b>Carrigtwohill</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification regarding table 4.2.5</li> <li>2. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> <li>3. Potential impact of the CT-B-01, and CT-B-02 zonings on the setting and integrity of the settlement as well as the high value landscape of the general harbour area.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Is additional wording in relation to parking and development within the town centre, including regeneration sites, required to advance the goal of modal shift.</li> <li>5. Is it appropriate to amend to Table 4.2.7 so that the reference to access to individual dwellings to/from Western Spine Link Road A and Eastern Spine Link Road B refers to vehicular access only?</li> <li>6. Should user prioritisation (pedestrian, etc.) in the context of proposed changes which may affect Carrigtwohill's historic fabric be reiterated?</li> <li>7. Potential for development of the linear park at CT-GC-07 and CT-GC-08 to compromise the ecological integrity of CT-GC-07 and CT-GC 08.</li> <li>8. Is it necessary for the Plan to include wording within objective CT-X-01 stating that the station car park may in time provide valuable potential development land, depending on its usage levels?</li> <li>9. Can and should the CDP limit the future build footprint of the town? Cobh</li> <li>10. Is there a need for an increased emphasis on investment in transport infrastructure rather than road infrastructure in the local context section of the Draft Plan?</li> <li>11. Is additional wording in relation to both the expansion of tourism offering and the CH-X-02 required to state that development would be subject to the outcome of the planning process and environmental assessments?</li> <li>12. Is it necessary to have an equal amount of zoned lands split between LI-I-01 and LI-GC-01 to more appropriately distribute the weight of human incursion on the natural environment in the area?</li> <li>13. Does the plan adequately support permeability, active travel and the importance of native tree planting in Cobh?</li> <li>14. Is it necessary to include additional text in the plan regarding light pollution and a commitment to enforcing the sensitive installation and operation of lighting in the harbour, where possible? Monard:</li> <li>15. Is clarification needed regarding the relationship between the 2016 scheme and current planning policy and are amendments to the planning scheme necessary and possible? Glounthaune:</li> <li>16. Issue of the importance of the trees at GN-R-01 – the Ashbourne site and the requirement for additional text to reflect this.</li> <li>17. Clarification that GN-U-01 is for cyclists and pedestrians. Watergrasshill:</li> <li>18. Is it necessary to reference the Meenane protected groundwater source in the Watergrasshill section?</li> <li>19. Sensitivity of WT-GC-01 Fota:</li> <li>20. Is additional wording regarding disabled access to station required?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed population increase in table 4.2.5 is the differential between the 2016 population and the 2028 population target. See related proposed amendment NO. 4.2.3.23, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, as a consequential change of amendment to Core Strategy - See related proposed amendment 1.2.14, Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>3. The Draft Plan seeks to appropriately balance environmental considerations and economic growth. Carrigtwohill is identified in the Draft Plan as a strategic employment location reflecting the integration of land use and transport planning and maximising the rail offering and the potential for sustainable transport. A strong employment offering is therefore required in Carrigtwohill and this has necessitated zoning greenfield land and land that is outside of the build footprint of the town. A number of the employment zonings in the town are already developed. The CT-B-01 and CT-B-02 are not identified as having very significant ecological habitats and it preferable to provide employment here than on alternative peripheral sites outside of the development boundary. Given the strong population growth proposed for Carrigtwohill it is considered appropriate to provide for a sufficient quantum of employment land in Carrigtwohill, to facilitate the sustainable development of the town, providing people with the opportunity to live close to where they work. Objective CT-GO-03, outlined above, and Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment, objective BE-15-6: Biodiversity and New Development will provide for the sensitive design of development to provide for the protection of trees, hedgerows and other ecological features.</li> <li>4. It is considered that there are sufficiently strong policy objectives in Chapter 12 Transport to achieve modal shift.</li> <li>5. It is agreed that it would be preferable to include the word vehicular so that pedestrian access onto the footpaths adjoining the key road projects listed could be accommodated. In addition it is proposed to apply footnote text to additional project listed in table 4.2.7. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.3.6. Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>6. As in 4 above, it is considered that there are sufficiently strong policy objectives in Chapter 12 Transport to achieve modal shift.</li> <li>7. Policies in the Plan support biodiversity protection and enhancement such as Objective BE-15-2 Protect Sites, Habitats and Species, Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. It is considered that these are sufficient to protect the ecological integrity of CT-GC-07 and CT-GC 08.</li> <li>8. The station car park is considered necessary to facilitate multi-modal travel and in time it may evolve to accommodate other facilities such as public bike sharing facilities, secure bike parking, car sharing facilities etc. It is envisaged that this facility will maximise rail travel and it is not considered appropriate to determine a potential alternative future development use for the land in this plan.</li> <li>9. As the Core Strategy does not set growth targets for the next plan period it would not be appropriate to limit the future built footprint of the town. The next plan will determine the requirement for development land for its delivery in accordance with national objectives to achieve compact growth.</li> <li>10. The reference to investment in road infrastructure in the Local Context section of Cobh reflects the identification of the R624 upgrade as a</li> </ol>
--	--

national enabler in the Southern RSES. Investment in transport infrastructure is also reference in the section on Movement, in relation to the Metropolitan Area Cycle Network Plan, Inter Urban Route I-U1, new rail station at Ballynoe, etc.

11. All development, and not just at CH-X-02, is subject to the outcome of the planning process and any required environmental assessments and it is not considered necessary to state this.
12. Land is zoned in consideration of the most appropriate use of particular sites as well as the likely quantum of land necessary to deliver particular land uses rather than any need to balance the amounts/areas/hectares of land zoned for particular uses. IN this case the LI-GC-01 is geographically limited to the east and south by the harbour. It is not necessary to extend it westward as it is considered adequate in area to fulfil its role of providing a buffer between industrial land and the SPA. The extend of the LI-I-01 reflects Little Island's role as a Strategic Employment Location.
13. Comprehensive objectives in chapter 12 Transport and Mobility support active travel and permeability (see TM 12-2 and TM 12-1). Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, objective PL3-1 j. also promotes permeability. Policies in the Plan support biodiversity enhancement and the planting of native trees such as Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. In addition, recommendations are made to strengthen the wording in Objective 15-6(c) to require a majority of native trees and plants in the landscaping of new development and Council projects. See also general objectives for Cobh town CH-GO-03 and CH-GO-13. See proposed amendments NO. 1.15.9, NO 1.15.11, NO 1.15.12, and, in relation to net gain, NO. 1.15.6 Volume 2, Part 1 of this report.
14. It is proposed to amend objective BE15-13(c) regarding the minimisation and control of light pollution to include reference to the Dark Sky principles. See proposed amendment 1.15.4 Volume 2, Part 1, Biodiversity.
15. It is proposed that compliance of the Monard planning scheme with current planning policy will be assessed.
16. It is proposed to include additional text in the Glounthaune Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity section and in objective GN-R-01 to reflect recently acquired data regarding the significance of trees on the site. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO. 4.2.8.3, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.
17. GN-U-01 is for cyclists and pedestrians and it is proposed to amend the text to reflect the specific objective wording. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.8.4, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.
18. Policy in chapter 11 Water Management provides for the protection of groundwater sources – see objectives WM11-3 and WM 11-5. It is not considered necessary to specifically reference protected groundwater sources within the MD chapters.
19. The reference in objective WT-GC-01 to the area of ecological importance and the policies, and objectives of Chapter 15 Biodiversity,

	<p>is considered to be sufficient to ensure the sensitive provision of an amenity area within this zoning. It is proposed to expand this area slightly - see proposed amendment NO. 4.2.9.2, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Watergrasshill.</p> <p>20. As mentioned in the submission, there is support for the provision of disabled access to public transport within the Transport and Mobility Chapter. It is also proposed to strengthen in relation to access for persons with disabilities and the 'whole journey' approach. See proposed amendments NO. 1.12.8, NO. 1.12.6, Volume 2, Part 1, Transport and Mobility. This is considered sufficient and it is not within the remit of the plan to identify particular locations where such facilities may need to be upgraded.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Reduce area of CT-I-01. Amend Table 4.2.7 (Carrigtwohill North UEA core on-site infrastructure programme). Amend BE15-13(c) to include reference to Dark Sky Principles. Amend Objective 15-6(c) and Objective BE15-4(a) to require a majority of native trees and plants in the landscaping of new development and Council projects. Include additional text in the Glounthaune Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity section and in objective GN-R-01 to reflect recently acquired data regarding the significance of trees on the site. Amend the text of GN-U-01 to reflect the specific objective wording.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346254537</b>	DCDP346254537
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that Knockraha Village needs Community grounds pitches and amenity areas, including a playground. States that if the area zoned GA-01 does not become available the hopes for these facilities within close proximity of the village are diminished.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of active open space in Knockraha.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site zoned GA-01, proximate to the school and existing residential development is considered to be the most suitable site for the provision of active open space. Issues of ownership and site availability can change and as such it is the suitability of the site for the land use proposed that has determined the zoning of this site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346261310</b>	DCDP346261310
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that Watergrasshill village, despite being by-passed by the M8, suffers traffic congestion, mainly due to lack of parking for residents, Staff, employees and customers of the businesses and services within the village boundary. States that a public car park is needed.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Congestion and parking in Watergrasshill.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Implementation of the objectives in Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility to achieve modal shift and the Avoid-Shift-Improve approach to transport policy should help alleviate congestion. Notwithstanding this it is recognised that

	there is a need for a car park and provision has been made for same with WT-X-01.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346263598</b>	DCDP346263598
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that Watergrasshill's population has expanded and continues to expand. States that the primary school must have sufficient area retained for further expansion for classrooms and pitches and green areas. States that the school is restricted on its Eastern and Northern sides by the M8.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Land needed for future expansion of school.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	WT-C-01 is for the provision of community facilities and the future expansion of educational facilities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346297736</b>	DCDP346297736
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Referencing the growth target for Watergrasshill, states that, given the good infrastructure and close proximity to M8, lands on the southern side of the development boundary are ideally located for further development. Adds that WT-R-01 is currently being developed.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is additional land required for development in Watergrasshill?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to amend the growth target for Watergrasshill to allow for additional growth beyond that identified in the Core Strategy. WT-R-01 is being developed and the development of WT-R-03 is largely completed. It is proposed to include an additional 2Ha within the development boundary of Watergrasshill, and to zone it for residential development. Land to the south west of the village, adjoining lands currently under construction, has been identified as being appropriate. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.9.3 Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Watergrasshill and NO 12.1.14, Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend development boundary of Watergrasshill to include an additional 2Ha within development boundary for residential development.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346293116</b>	DCDP346293116
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that Watergrasshill needs lands to be allocated for the development of a secondary school to serve surrounding villages and a large hinterland. Adds that this area should also include an area for pitches, courts and all associated works.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for an additional school in Watergrasshill?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify a need for a secondary school in Watergrasshill.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346288863</b>	DCDP346288863
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land adjoining and outside the development boundary to the north of Watergrasshill.</p> <p>States that Watergrasshill is within 10mins of Dunkettle interchange and 5km of Cork City Boundary. Submits that lands marked on attached map should be included within the development boundary. Outlines that it is located within 50km zone and in close proximity to the WWTP on a gentle slope.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a requirement to extend the development boundary at Watergrasshill?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to amend the growth target for Watergrasshill to allow for additional growth beyond that identified in the Core Strategy of the Draft Plan. WT-R-01 is being developed and the development of WT-R-03 is largely completed. It is proposed to include an additional 2Ha within the development boundary of Watergrasshill, and to zone it for residential development. Land to the south west of the village, adjoining lands currently under construction, has been identified as being appropriate. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.9.3, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Watergrasshill, and PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.9.3, Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed in relation to subject site. See however proposed amendment Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Watergrasshill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP345677236</b>	DCDP345677236
<b>Submission Summary</b>	States that Carrignavar lies within 4km north of Cork City and sets out the considered growth in the Plan of 10 units due to inadequate water supply and lack of capacity of WWTP. Suggests that lands to the North and East have development potential. States that an upgrade to the WWTP is crucial.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>The need for wate water services in Carrignavar to accommodate more development.</p> <p>Is an extension to the development boundary required?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Draft Plan recognises the need for a WWTP in Carrignavar. The level of growth identified for Carrignavar in the Core Strategy reflects the absence of adequate waste water services. The provision of same is within the remit of Irish Water. Irish Water have not indicated that such services will be provided within the lifetime of the CDP. There is ample land within the development boundary of Carrignavar to accommodate the proposed level of growth for the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP345681690</b>	DCDP345681690
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that the population of Carrignavar increased 4% between 2011-2016 and that Third level Students and non drivers need a more regular bus service



	to connect between Cork City, Little Island, Mallow and Fermoy. Submits that extending the Ballyvolane route should be considered.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	More regular bus service serving Carrignavar.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The need for strengthened public transport connections in Carrignavar is acknowledged in the Plan. While the plan highlights this need the provision of the service is outside the remit of the County Development Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Sheila O' Callaghan.</b>
<b>DCDP346258252</b>	DCDP346258252
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission states that Carrigtwohill is zoned for high density housing and that it has great road and rail connectivity. States that provision should be made for a high speed digital hub and public library within the town centre, or Main Street area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to specifically provide for a high speed digital hub and public library within the town centre of Carrigtwohill?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The provision of library facilities in the County is best pursued through application of the Library Service Development Plan 2020-2025. A regeneration site is identified in Carrigtwohill as having possible potential for a business start-up hub / remote working hub. A digital hub may also be appropriate elsewhere in the town centre. It is not considered necessary to zone land specifically for this.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Clona Dairies</b>
<b>DCDP346456289</b>	DCDP346456289
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to the site of a former milk depot and adjoining site of a National Testing Centre for lorries, within the Metropolitan Greenbelt at Ballinahina.  Points to established industrial use and common access roadway between the two properties and to additional lands which is states are ideal for development. Seeks rezoning of the two sites recognising their industrial use.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is an amendment to the Metropolitan Greenbelt appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to exclude the subject lands from the greenbelt.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cobh Tidy Towns</b>
<b>DCDP346246697</b>	DCDP346246697
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Comprehensive submission which makes a number of specific comments and proposals for Cobh town and Great Island in relation to the following: public realm; connectivity (rail timetabling, road infrastructure – including

	<p>access to Great Island, pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, bus parking, park and ride site, car parking); redevelopment/reuse of vacant buildings; safeguarding of amenity, historical context and harbour views; regeneration of vacant/underutilised sites; community infrastructure and services; waterfront/waterbased amenity; significance of Dockyard; protection of rights of way; protection/enhancement of biodiversity; housing tenure, accommodation for older persons, permitted uses within business zonings, objective regarding hotel.</p> <p>Submits that, as a town with great facilities, growth in Cobh’s population will only be hampered by a lack of places to live and that emphasis must be on having more people living in the town centre by utilising existing vacant buildings and sites first. States that the quality of life of the residents must be protected and investment in transport, infrastructure, school and community facilities needs to take place in tandem with housing developments while preserving Cobh’s many green spaces and amenities.</p> <p>States that the Cobh Public Realm plans and investment are a serious vote of confidence by Cork County Council in the future of Cobh, and that additional investment on ancillary and essential projects will be necessary if the return on this investment is to be optimised.</p> <p>Find that the draft plan lacks the ambition to make Cobh the premier tourism destination on the south coast of Ireland.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. public realm - The Cobh Public Realm Enhancement plans and investment are a serious vote of confidence by Cork County Council in the future of Cobh. Additional investment on ancillary and essential projects will be necessary if the return on the Cobh Public Realm Enhancement plan is to be optimised.;</li> <li>2. connectivity (rail timetabling, road infrastructure – including access to Great Island, pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, bus parking, park and ride site, car parking, lack of connectivity from Ballynoe valley);</li> <li>3. redevelopment/reuse of vacant buildings and vacant/underutilised sites;</li> <li>4. safeguarding of amenity, historical context and harbour views;</li> <li>5. community infrastructure and services;</li> <li>6. waterfront/waterbased amenity;</li> <li>7. significance of Dockyard;</li> <li>8. protection of rights of way;</li> <li>9. protection/enhancement of biodiversity;</li> <li>10. Local authority partnering with Housing Associations and others to provide assisted living complexes accommodation for older persons,</li> <li>11. Exclusion or retail warehousing from B-01, B-02 and B-03,</li> <li>12. objective regarding hotel similar to text used for Bandon.</li> <li>13. Demolition of derelict piers.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility contains comprehensive objectives to achieve modal shift, promote sustainable transport and increasing permeability is an element of this. It is intended that a Local Transport Plan will be prepared for Cobh which will further assist the delivery of the 10 minute town, enhanced permeability and connectivity. The CH-I-01 site includes provision for a Park and Ride facility. Site ownership is subject to change and the ownership status of the CH-U-11 doesn't</li> </ol>

	<p>necessarily preclude the future development of the site. It is considered appropriate to retain the objective for a multi storey car park for this site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Chapter 3 of the Plan includes an objective PL 3-2 to use the upper floors of the existing town centre building stock for appropriate uses including residential. See also paragraph 3.5.16 of chapter 3. In addition, a number of regeneration sites are identified in Cobh town.</li> <li>4. It is considered that the plan adequately affords protection to amenity values, historical context, and harbour views. See Cobh in Volume 4 of the Plan, Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage and Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure in Volume 1 of the Plan, See also Volume 2 of the Plan.</li> <li>5. The recommendation of a community infrastructure audit is noted. While a survey of community facilities informed the Plan an additional, more comprehensive audit is outside the remit of the CDP process.</li> <li>6. The recommendations regarding waterfront amenity are noted – the provision of same is outside the remit of the CDP process.</li> <li>7. The strategic significance of the dockyard is acknowledged in the plan.</li> <li>8. Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.</li> <li>9. There are a number of policies in the plan to support biodiversity protection and enhancement. See Chapter 15, BE 15-2 Protect sites, habitats and species. Additionally, in July 2021 the Council formally signed up to the All Ireland Pollinator Plan.</li> <li>10. The issue of housing provision is an operation issue outside of the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>11. B-01, B-02 and B-03 are the only business zonings in Cobh, It is considered appropriate that they be retained for business uses excluding retail warehousing. There is significant provision of retail warehousing in nearby settlements.</li> <li>12. Hotel - there are a number of sites in Bandon which may be suitable for a hotel – for example, lands zoned BD-T-02, BD-T-03 or BD-T-04 are currently under utilised or have vacant sites where a new hotel use would be compatible subject to an appropriate design response. There are no such similar sites in Cobh town centre of that scale identified however paragraph 2.4.49 recognises that there may be potential for a hotel development to support an expanding tourism industry and this could be accommodated by sensitive regeneration within the town centre.</li> <li>13. The demolition of derelict piers is an issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan. There is however an objective in the Plan, CH-X-02, regarding the development of Lynch’s Quay. It is also proposed to amend this objective. See proposed amendment Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Cobh.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Connaught Trust Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346214873</b>	DCDP346214873
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to lands, comprising 37ha overall, that form part of the Carrigtwohill North UEA, located to the north and south of the railway line. Requests that the

	<p>CT-R-17 zoning of the LAP (part of CT-GC-06) be reinstated and expanded and that the CT-R-16 zoning of the LAP (part of CT-GC-07) be expanded. Supports the change to the CT-R-12 zoning of the LAP (CT-R-13) indicating that this would have been difficult to develop.</p> <p>Outlines that a masterplan for the phased delivery of housing on subject lands has been developed, that pre planning discussions regarding its delivery have taken place, but that the proposed revisions in the Draft Plan to the zoning objectives of the subject lands have the potential to disrupt the proposed phasing of housing delivery on the lands and reduce the potential housing yield of same.</p> <p>Outlines Draft plan growth target and density proposals for Carrigtwohill, and makes reference to existing and planned social infrastructure and services. Indicates that the majority of zoned land in Carrigtwohill remains undeveloped.</p> <p>Outlines planning policy context making reference to identification of Major New Residential Neighbourhood in 2005 Carrigtwohill Special Local Area Plan, to the NPF and its National Strategic Outcomes, the RSES and its reference to Carrigtwohill, to the 2014 CDP, to the 2017 Cobh MD LAP and to the Draft Plan. Outlines that the Draft Plan's CT-GC-06 zoning comprises an expanded area which incorporates the former CT-R-17 residential zoning, and that the Draft Plan's CT-O-07 zoning extends to encompass parts of the previous LAP CT-R-12 zoning. Also outlines density changes to zonings.</p> <p>Submission details proposed planning application on land that is within CT-GC-06 for c65 dwellings including cycle track provision to form part of proposed greenway. Details preplanning regarding a c150 residential unit development on CT-R-09 which it was advised would be premature pending the finalisation of the route options for new roads and infrastructure currently being prepared. Also details planned delivery of required infrastructure, including access upgrades stating that development of subject lands can deliver c1,750 metres of greenway to north of the rail line, pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway line (CT-U-10 in Draft Plan), and construction of greenway to south of the rail line. Sees the development of the subject lands as assisting in the delivery of key infrastructural upgrades required to unlock the UAE and IDA lands potential.</p> <p>Submits that the increase in the size of the CT-GC-06 objective is not required and not supported on ecological grounds and requests that approach to revision of Open Space zonings aimed at providing green corridors is revisited.</p> <p>States that proposed masterplan includes generous open space provision and states that areas identified as flood risk are designed to accommodate an open space function. Also submits Pre connection enquiry correspondence from Irish Water and an Ecological Assessment of the lands.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the full extent of the CT-GC-06 zoning merited?</li> <li>2. Is the full extent of the CT-GC-07 zoning merited?</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Is it considered appropriate to amend the wording of objectives CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07 to exclude reference to the significant ecological green infrastructure within the sites?</li> <li>4. Is the development of the entirety of subject lands crucial to assisting in the delivery of key infrastructural upgrades required to unlock the UAE and IDA lands potential.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A significant area, at the east of CT-GC-06 supports scrub habitat of ecological value and enhanced by virtue of the fact that it forms part of a larger mosaic of semi-natural habitats. There is an area of flood risk at the west of CT-GC-06. There is an area of 0.8Ha towards the centre of this site that does not currently have a significant habitat or apparent flood risk. This land features a dwelling house and a large storage yard and as such it is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to identify this as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.3.26.</li> <li>2. There is a significant area of higher species richness scrub habitat on land that was zoned residential in the LAP and that is now within CT-GC-07. Such habitat is of ecological value, and the value of the site is further enhanced by virtue of the fact that the site now forms part of a larger complex of semi-natural habitats. It is not considered appropriate to amend this zoning.</li> <li>3. It is not considered appropriate to amend the wordings of the open space zonings to allow for residential development. As both CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07 contain habitat of ecological significance it is considered appropriate to reflect that in the objective wording for the sites.</li> <li>4. The most appropriate UEA phasing has been carefully identified through the substantial work undertaken by the Council's Housing Infrastructure Implementation Team which envisages delivery of the western portion of the UEA first. It is not considered appropriate to amend the UEA phasing .</li> </ol> <p>Note also that proposed amendments to categorisation of residential zonings are proposed to reflect amendments to the Core Strategy and these are of relevance to subject lands. See proposed amendments NO. 4.2.3.12, NO. 4.2.3.15, NO. 4.2.3.16, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill and NO 1.2.12 Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend site so that land containing dwelling house and storage yard are rezoned as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Diocesan Trustees and Carrig na Fhear Parish</b>
<b>DCDP345542136</b>	DCDP345542136
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to current/former school site in Carrignavar in the centre of the village. States that a condition of the permission for the development of the new school requires that the existing school site be disconnected from the wastewater network pending agreement with Irish Water and submits that this appears to preclude alternative use or redevelopment of the current/former school site until capacity is provided.</p> <p>Outlines the policy for the village in the 2017 Local Area Plan and the Draft Plan. It states that submitter does not accept that Irish Water has no long-term plans</p>

	<p>to upgrade the treatment plant or the implicit assumption that it is not possible to achieve short term gains in capacity through use of pre-treatment or greater separation of storm and foul networks.</p> <p>Submits that the WWTP upgrade is required to restore water quality in the river and that a 10 unit restriction on residential development could undermine this as it feels that Irish Water is unlikely to prioritise the upgrade if no dwellings can avail of the increased capacity during the next plan period.</p> <p>Submits that additional housing units served by individual wastewater treatment units would undermine the objective of maintaining a tight urban grain as new housing could not be focused on central brownfield sites.</p> <p>Requests that the growth target be 100 housing units for the plan period, that this target would be made dependent on adequate spare capacity in the wastewater treatment plant, and that brownfield development be prioritised in the allocation of any spare capacity with explicit reference to the change of use or redevelopment of the school.</p> <p>It outlines that investment in the site for the new school was made with the expectation that the population of the school catchment would be maintained and that there would be a beneficial use for the former school.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The need for water services in Carrignavar to accommodate more development.</li> <li>2. Possibility of 10 unit restriction on residential development undermining the possibility of a WWTP upgrade being delivered.</li> <li>3. Brownfield development be prioritised in the allocation of any spare capacity with explicit reference to the change of use or redevelopment of the school.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Draft Plan recognises the need for a WWTP in Carrignavar. The level of growth identified for Carrignavar in the Core Strategy reflects the absence of adequate waste water services. The provision of same is within the remit of Irish Water. Irish Water have not indicated that such services will be provided within the lifetime of the CDP.</li> <li>2. The Planning Authority does not agree that the low level of growth identified for Carrignavar will undermine any future possibility of a WWTP being delivered by Irish Water. Note however, as outlined above, this is not part of their current investment plan.</li> <li>3. As there is no spare capacity in the WWTP it is not possible to prioritise allocation of same.</li> </ol> <p>See Key issue, Volume 1, Water Management.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Dockyard Holdings Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344617618</b>	DCDP344617618
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to an approx 17.8 Ha site at Rushbrooke referred to as Cork Dockyard and Cork Dockyard Holdings expansion plans to develop a renewable energy construction and maintenance facility for offshore wind turbines. Generally in favour of objective in the Draft Plan for the site but strongly objects to the provision of a park and ride, submitting that is would compromise the health

	<p>and safety of the site and that the reduction in space availability may compromise the site's suitability for the renewable energy facility.</p> <p>Requests that the plan emphasise the potential of the site as a turbine pre-assembly and operations base for the offshore marine energy sector and it also seeks the inclusion in the plan for the facilitation of general industry on the site.</p> <p>Seeks the removal of specific references to environmental and ecological assessment and the upgrade of the R624, submitting that these are standard consideration of any specific development proposal and that the development is not dependant on the upgrade of the R624 as materials required for assembly on site can be transported by water. Regarding use of the road by commuters it refers to expected progress of plans to upgrade the road.</p> <p>Restates the recognition of the strategic importance of the Dockyard given in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Describes Cork Dockyard Holdings expansion plans to develop a renewable energy facility, outlining economic and educational benefits of same. Refers to a report published by the Irish Maritime Development Office stating that the Dockyard has been identified by a number of foreign groups as a potential hub for the offshore wind energy sector with the necessary infrastructure and facilities including quayside lengths, water depth, hinterland and dry dock to support operational, maintenance and servicing of offshore windfarm installations.</p> <p>Points to the national Climate Action Plan and its reference to off shore renewables as well as reference to renewable energy in the Draft CDP. It submits that the Dockyard vision will assist the state in meeting its climate change targets.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support of objective CH-I-01 with exception of Park and Ride element.</li> <li>2. Potential of CH-I-01 site as a hub for the offshore wind energy sector.</li> <li>3. Is it appropriate to make reference to environment and ecology in the CH-I-01 zoning objective?</li> <li>4. Is it appropriate to state in the CH-I-01 zoning objective that the service hub for the offshore marine energy sector is subject to environmental assessment and upgrade of R624?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The general support for CH-I-01 is noted. It is considered that a park and ride at Rushbrooke would optimise the use of the Rushbrooke rail station and in the absence of a suitable alternative site, it is considered appropriate to retain the requirement for park and ride provision on the CH-I-01.</li> <li>2. The potential of CH-I-01 site as a hub for the offshore wind energy sector is acknowledged in the Plan.</li> <li>3. It is considered appropriate to make reference to the Annex 1 estuaries habitat that the zoning adjoins and to require that account will be taken of this habitat of ecological value when considering development proposals in that area in order to highlight the existence of the habitat and the need for its protection. It is also considered appropriate to highlight that the potential of the site as a service hub for the offshore marine energy sector shall be subject to environmental assessment in order to highlight, in the context of the proximity to ecological habitat, the need for environmental assessment.</li> </ol>



	<p>4. It is noted that the submission states that all material required for offshore wind can arrive (for assembly onsite) and leave the site by water and not by road. Accordingly, it is proposed to remove the reference to the service hub being subject to the upgrade of the R624 and to amend this so that any such development would be subject to capacity of the R624 - see proposed amendment NO. 4.2.4.24, volume 2, Part 2 of this report.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend objective CH-I-01 so that development of the site as a hub for the offshore marine energy sector is subject to capacity of the R624 rather than upgrade of the R624.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>CS Salon</b>
<b>DCDP344288041</b>	DCDP344288041
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that the parking in Watergrasshill village is becoming an increasing problem and causing concern - clients often cannot find adequate parking spaces to attend appointments at the submitter's business. Fears that this issue will worsen with further growth in the village and urges Cork County Council to consider a car park in the village to help ease these problems.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Lack of parking in Watergrasshill.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Implementation of the objectives in Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility to achieve modal shift and the Avoid-Shift-Improve approach to transport policy should help alleviate congestion. Notwithstanding this it is recognised that there is a need for a car park and provision has been made for same with WT-X-01.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>D. GRAINGER</b>
<b>DCDP345779890</b>	DCDP345779890
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to the CT-I-01 zoning in Carrigtwohill. States that this proposed change of land use is both excessive and immoral, stating that there are a vast number of industrial sites close to this area already. Adds that there are a number of vacant industrial sites locally which have been left derelict.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Demesne Scally Holdings Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346110369</b>	DCDP346110369
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to the former Harbour Point Golf Course, c 45.01 Ha towards the eastern end of Little Island.</p> <p>States that it endorses and supports the LI-X-01 and the LI-RR-01 objectives that apply to the entire site and seeks a number of changes to same.</p> <p>It submits that it notes that the LI-X-01 objective envisages the provision of new</p>

	<p>housing in the short-term with the LL-RR-01 objective envisaging the provision of new housing during the lifetime of the Plan. It states that these will facilitate the delivery of future housing and additional population, to ensure Little Island will function as a truly sustainable location and that, in addition to existing and proposed employment uses, the projected increase in population will underpin further investment in enhanced sustainable transportation measures, quality social and community infrastructure and unrivalled amenities. Submits that residential uses at the subject site is consistent with the overriding emphasis of national, regional and local policy on compact growth in existing built-up urban areas, reuse of brownfield land, and balanced regional development.</p> <p>Supports the requirement of the preparation of a framework plan for the development of LI-X-01 and expects that the two landowners will be able to come together to prepare this. Requests that, in the event of both parties not reaching agreement, the Council prepare a framework plan.</p> <p>In relation to the neighbourhood centre element of the LI-X-01 objective it submits that, noting the existing part vacant neighbourhood centre at Eastgate, at best, a local shop or local café and a creche facility may be the extent of the neighbourhood centre that could be facilitated on subject lands and that anything more significant may undermine what it refers to as the principal neighbourhood shopping location serving Little Island. Seeks a revision to the reference to a neighbourhood centre in favour of a reference to the provision of local services.</p> <p>Submits that there is no evidence to support the requirement for an additional school in Little Island in the context of the existing and projected population, making reference to Little Island primary school and other schools in the vicinity of, or serving, Little Island, and seeking removal of that aspect of LI-X-01</p> <p>Questions the reference to bird species using the subject lands as feeding ground and holds view that in the final Plan, a detailed bird surveys will inform the nature and extent of any development proposals for the subject lands. Submits that the references in LI-X-01 to the Special Protection Area are not necessary as all sites in Little Island will be required to have regard to the Natura 2000 network in the vicinity.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generally endorses and supports the LI-X-01 and the LI-RR-01 objectives that apply to the entire site.</li> <li>2. Issue of responsibility for preparation of framework plan.</li> <li>3. What scale of neighbourhood centre is appropriate for the LI-X-01?</li> <li>4. Is it necessary to identify land for an educational facility in Little Island?</li> <li>5. Is the reference to the SPA and to bird species appropriate?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for LI-X-01 and LI-RR-02 is noted.</li> <li>2. It is considered appropriate that the landowners prepare the framework plan for the overall development of the site and it is noted that the submitter expects that the two landowners will be able to come together to prepare that.</li> <li>3. The growth target for Little Island is concentrated within the LI-X-01 which is to deliver 500 residential units. In order to allow for this to be developed as a new sustainable residential neighbourhood it is</li> </ol>

	<p>considered necessary to provide a neighbourhood centre to serve the residents. It is envisaged that this would be a small scale, local neighbourhood centre and it is proposed to amend the wording of the objective to clarify this. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.5.8, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</p> <p>4. The Department of Education, in its submission to the Draft Plan, does not identify a requirement for an additional school in Little Island. Accordingly, it is proposed to remove the requirement for the provision of a school from the LI-X-01 objective wording. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.5.9, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</p> <p>5. The site is located in close proximity to the Cork Harbour SPA and it is proposed to amend the wording of the objective so that it is more accurate and is consistent with objectives for other sites also in close proximity to the Cork Harbour SPA. New wording will reflect that areas within it may be used by Special Conservation Interest bird species for which the Cork Harbour SPA is designated and that account will be taken of same when considering new development proposals in this area. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.5.12, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend LI-X-01 to exclude the reference to the school, to clarify that the neighbourhood centre to be provided is to be a local, small scale centre and to include new wording regarding proximity to the SPA that is more accurate and consistent with sites similarly located.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Diarmuid O'Dalaigh</b>
<b>DCDP346260127</b>	DCDP346260127
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to 14Ha lands outside of, east of, and adjoining the Carrigtwohill development boundary and adjoining the CT-I-03 zoning. Seeks that the lands be regarded as presenting development opportunities for Carrigtwohill and Midleton. Sets out locational context of site which comprises a dwelling and greenfield lands. Sets out planning policy context from 2014 CDP, making reference to Strategic Land Reserve in which subject land is located, the Cobh MD and East Cork MD 2017 LAPs, the Draft Plan and its growth target for Carrigtwohill, and its reference to the benefit of a commuter rail service in Carrigtwohill. Sets out a rationale for the submission request which includes the following - adjoins serviced lands with industrial zoning, north of N25 and south of rail line, upgrade to N25 proposed in Project Ireland 2040, requirement for rail station within objective on adjoining lands. Acknowledges difficulty of restoring Strategic Land Reserve objective for wider area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it necessary to zone land in the Metropolitan Greenbelt between Carrigtwohill and Midleton for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is ample land zoned in the settlements of Carrigtwohill and Midleton to meet the level of growth identified for the plan period. The land zoned in the Plan is closer to the town centres of Carrigtwohill or Midleton. This land is in the County Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt an objective of which is to prevent coalescence of built up areas and to focus attention on lands within settlements

	which are zoned for development. The consideration of additional employment land is premature pending completion of a business land availability study within 2 years of the adoption of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donal &amp; Maria O'Neill</b>
<b>DCDP346279914</b>	DCDP346279914
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to a small site at Kilcronan, Whitechurch, within the Development Boundary of Monard SDZ . Submitters wishes to apply for planning permission on the site and requests that it be removed or adjusted (type of adjustment not specified) as part of the Draft Plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to adjust the Monard SDZ to accommodate individual permissions within the SDZ.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Monard planning scheme is not being amended in the Plan however it is proposed that compliance of the Monard planning scheme with current planning policy will be assessed. Incremental erosion of the scheme would not be appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donal &amp; Maria O'Neill</b>
<b>DCDP346172389</b>	DCDP346172389
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission seems to be a duplicate of submission DCDP346279914.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See submission DCDP346279914.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See submission DCDP346279914.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See submission DCDP346279914.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donal O'Reilly</b>
<b>DCDP346269193</b>	DCDP346269193
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to a 12.87ha site to the south of Watergrasshill, outside of and adjoining the development boundary of the village, which it seeks to have included within the development boundary for housing. Submits that the land represents the next logical phase of development for the village considering its access to local approach road and recent adjacent residential development. Details national planning policy regarding compact growth and renewal and development of existing settlements. Makes reference to relevant policy, primarily regarding villages, in Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009, in Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Rural Housing 2005, and in the 2014 CDP. Also makes reference to the Government's Action Plan for Rural Development, and Rebuilding Ireland. Outlines national population growth targets as well as those for the County. Submits that the sustainable development of key villages in Cork County over the previous plan period has largely failed to materialise and proposes a

	proactive approach to encourage development of suitably located sites that will support consolidated growth of existing settlements. Points to the availability of water services in the village, flat topography of site and envisages minimal environmental impact from development of site.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for additional zoned land in Watergrasshill for residential development to meet the growth target for the settlement?</li> <li>2. Is this site the most appropriate location for any additional residential development required?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A revision of the Core Strategy of the Plan has identified a requirement for an additional 59 residential units to be delivered during the lifetime of the plan. Additional zoning is required in Watergrasshill. See proposed amendment relating to alternative land, Volume2, Part 2, Cobh MD</li> <li>2. While it is necessary to identify additional land for residential development a site of this scale is not required. It is felt that there is alternative land that is more appropriate for residential development than this land.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donncha O Connell</b>
<b>DCDP346260624</b>	DCDP346260624
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to lands in Carrignavar, which are within the development boundary of the 2017 LAP, and most of which, in the Draft CDP, are within the development boundary of the village and part of which are outside of the boundary. Seeks reinstatement of the development boundary to that of the 2017 LAP and a growth target of 100 units subject to Waste Water Infrastructure being provided. Submission questions the reduction of the growth target to 10 houses given the planning history of the subject lands and the investment in a new primary school in the village. Supports streamlined approach to policy and zoning in a single plan and supports the plan's focus on densifying and consolidating sustainable locations. Raises a concern that de-zoning land will inflate value of remaining lands. The landowner, intends submitting a planning application for residential development in Carrignavar on an area within the site of a now expired permission for 200 homes and sports fields. While it sees that wastewater infrastructure investment will be critical to deliverability it suggests that commitment could be made to upgrading the WWTP at any time during the development cycle or that policies regarding group wastewater treatment plants or temporary waste water treatment plants will change. Outlines that there is public transport to the city from the village, that it is proximate to Blackpool and that there are local services in the village, including an increased capacity new school. Sets out some planning policy context including reference to the National Planning Framework policies, 2014 CDP vision and growth targets, and 2017 LAP 100 unit growth target for Carrignavar. Finds that the 10 unit growth target for the village in the Draft Plan is contradictory and points out that, as a key village, Carrignavar is second to main towns in the settlement hierarchy.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the growth target for this village suitable?</li> <li>2. Is an extension to the development boundary of Carrignavar necessary?</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The level of growth identified for Carrignavar in the Core Strategy reflects the absence of adequate waste water services. The provision of same is within the remit of Irish Water. Irish Water have not indicated that such services will be provided within the lifetime of the CDP and as such the growth target for the village has been set at 10 residential units. See Key Issue, Volume 1, Water Management.</li> <li>2. There is ample land within the development boundary of the village to accommodate the level of growth identified for the plan period.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dr Stephen Thornhill</b>
<b>DCDP345392958</b>	DCDP345392958
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits that the vision for Cobh should not be about growth per se but sustainable growth in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and Paris Climate Change Agreement.</p> <p>Details local community/business efforts such as embracing circular economy; mobilisation to prevent development of incinerator in harbour which it states would have created huge emissions; collaboration such as Cobh Zero Waste group.</p> <p>Submits that past increased housing in Cobh without commensurate growth in local employment and sustainable transport has led to more commuting by road and pollution.</p> <p>States that priority should be developing new sustainable jobs which it suggests is expected to be boosted by the Port of Cork's plans for wind turbine assembly facilities in the old fertiliser plant quay. It also suggests that an anaerobic digester plant could improve community employment and resilience and it suggests a community recycling, repair and reuse facility including a Council supported community hub model.</p> <p>Suggests the following additional priorities: retrofitting of buildings to renewable energy, new building to be to passive standard and, increasing support for biodiversity initiatives and allotment initiatives.</p> <p>Submits that consideration should be given to reinstating the Town Council in Cobh noting a gap between community needs and Council action. Seeks greater local or national government support to community in meeting needs and preventing adverse development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The vision for Cobh should not be about growth per se but sustainable growth in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and Paris Climate Change Agreement.</li> <li>2. Support for local business and communities contributing to a more circular economy.</li> <li>3. Need employment provision in line with population growth to reduce unsustainable commuting.</li> <li>4. Energy efficiency in buildings.</li> <li>5. Planting of trees and other biodiversity initiatives on Great Island have been strongly supported by community initiatives, which should be increasingly supported. So too should community allotment initiatives that have so far been developed and funded by groups of private</li> </ol>

	<p>individuals. County Council support for existing and new allotment initiatives would help to improve biodiversity, healthy activity and the provision of local fresh foods.</p> <p>6. Reinstatement of Town Council.</p> <p>7. National/Local government support for communities in meeting needs and preventing adverse development.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed. The growth envisaged for Cobh will align with the policies and objective of the plan which are centred on the core principle of sustainability with a focus on creating vibrant, liveable, climate resilient communities. This is evident in the policies for Cobh town and the additional policies of Volume one underpinning these. See in particular Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking, Chapter 8 Economy and Employment, Chapter 13 Energy and Telecommunications, Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility, Chapter 15 Biodiversity, Chapter 17 Climate Action, Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage.</li> <li>2. As set out in Chapter 8 Economy and Employment, Cork County Council recognises that the transition to a more circular economy, based on long-life products that can be renewed, reused, repaired, upgraded and refurbished to preserve precious natural resources, protect habitats and reduce pollution, will provide an essential contribution to Cork County developing a sustainable, low carbon and competitive economy. See proposed amendment 1.8.1 to strengthen this text – NO. 1.8.1, Volume2, Part 1, Chapter 8.</li> <li>3. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility outlines the approach to integrating land use and transport planning as well as the Avoid-Shift-Improve approach to transport policy. In line with this, significant lands are identified for employment in Cobh. Investment in sustainable transport is also promoted to reduce the impact of any off island commuting – e.g. objective for a new rail station at Ballynoe.</li> <li>4. Chapter 13, Energy sets out an objective (ET 13.20) regarding Building Energy Efficiency and Conservation and it is proposed to strengthen this to require retrofitting of existing buildings. See proposed amendment 1.13.10, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 13 Energy.</li> <li>5. The policies in the Plan support community engagement in biodiversity initiatives (which would include allotments etc.) particularly in Objective BE 15-9 Support for Communities and Other Stakeholders. Other policies in the Plan support biodiversity enhancement and the planting of trees such as Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. It is proposed to amend the Plan to include a commitment to deliver a new County Biodiversity Action Plan which will provide detail on community actions and operational matters. See proposed amendment NO 1.15.1. See also NO. 1.15.9 Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 15 Biodiversity.</li> <li>6. The reinstatement of Town Councils is a national policy issue and is outside the remit of the County Development Plan.</li> <li>7. Implementation of the Plan in accordance with its policies and objectives will avoid adverse development. Objective SC 6-2: Social and Community Engagement, in Chapter 6 recognises the diversity of needs</li> </ol>



	of all citizens of various life stages, cultural and ethnic minorities, and ensure all have the opportunity to contribute to the development of their communities. See Proposed Amendment No. 1.6.3,
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend objective ET 13.20 to strengthen text regrading retrofitting of existing buildings. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 13 Energy. Amend the Plan to include a commitment to deliver a new County Biodiversity Action Plan which will provide detail on community actions and operational matters and amend objective BE 15-5 to support the principle of biodiversity net gain. Amend paragraph 8.8.1 to strengthen the text regarding the transition to a circular economy.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Edgefield Property Investments Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346208388</b>	DCDP346208388
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to greenfield landholding, comprising approx 37ha overall, that form part of the Carrigtwohill North Urban Expansion Area (UEA), located to the north and south of the railway line and that includes lands zoned CT-R-09, CT-GC-07, CT-R-16 (part of), CT-R-17, and CT-GC-06 (part of) in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Submitter indicates that they welcome the upgrade of land zoned CT-R-09 in the LAP (they are likely referring to land zoned CT-R-09 in the Draft Plan), making reference to high density zoning within phase one of the UEA. Indicates that they also welcome the increase in density from medium B to medium A for sites CT-R-15 and CT-R-16 of the LAP (CT-R-16 &amp; CT-R-17 of the Draft Plan).</p> <p>Submits that there are a number of changes in the Draft Plan which negatively impact on the land holding. These are the expansion of CT-GC-07 to include part of land which was zoned CT-R-12 in the LAP, and which they say is linked to CT-R-09 to the west; and the expansion of CT-GC06 to include land which was zoned CT-R-17 in the LAP.</p> <p>States that both of these sites are well connected to existing transport infrastructure within the area and are centrally placed to deliver sustainable well connected communities, making reference to the planned CT-U-03 greenway; states that both sites benefit from strategic connections within the UEA and that the possibility of bringing forward residential development is achievable within the short to medium term; and states that both sites benefit from existing connections to services.</p> <p>Supports the principle of a green infrastructure corridor but considers sites are better served under a residential zoning designation. Questions ecological value of CT-GC-06.</p> <p>Seeks the following: that part of the land that is within CT-GC-07 be included within CT-R-13 (that the LAP CT-R-12 zoned area is reinstated), that part of CT-GC-06 is zoned residential (that the LAP CT-R-17 zoned area is reinstated), that all of the subject landholding zoned residential in the Draft Plan be promoted to the first phase of development of the UEA; and that the text of objectives CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07 be altered to deleted reference to 'significant ecological' and to allow for development of the sites.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is the extent of the CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07 zonings merited?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Is it appropriate for lands zoned as open space to have objective wording that provides for development?</li> <li>3. Is it appropriate to remove the reference to ecological significance from objectives CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07.</li> <li>4. Should the UEA phasing be altered so that the subject landholding is within phase one?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A significant area, at the east of CT-GC-06 supports scrub habitat of ecological value and enhanced by virtue of the fact that it forms part of a larger mosaic of semi-natural habitats. There is an area of flood risk at the west of CT-GC-06. There is an area of c0.8Ha towards the centre of this site that does not currently have a significant habitat or apparent flood risk. This land features a dwelling house and a large storage yard and as such it is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to identify this as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.3.26, volume 2, part 2 of this report. There is a significant area of higher species richness scrub habitat on land that was zoned residential in the LAP and that is now within CT-GC-07. Such habitat is of ecological value, and the value of the site is further enhanced by virtue of the fact that the site now forms part of a larger complex of semi-natural habitats. It is not considered appropriate to amend the CT-GC-07 zoning.</li> <li>2. It is not considered appropriate to amend the wordings of the open space zonings to allow for residential development. As both CT-GC-06 and CT-GC-07 contain habitat of ecological significance it is considered appropriate to reflect that in the objective wording for the sites.</li> <li>3. There is a significant area of higher species richness scrub habitat on land that was zoned residential in the LAP and that is now within CT-GC-07. Such habitat is of ecological value, and the value of the site is further enhanced by virtue of the fact that the site now forms part of a larger complex of semi-natural habitats. It is not considered appropriate to amend this zoning.</li> <li>4. The most appropriate UEA phasing has been carefully identified through the substantial work undertaken by the Council's Housing Infrastructure Implementation Team which envisages delivery of the western portion of the UEA first. It is not considered appropriate to amend the UEA phasing.</li> </ol> <p>Note also that proposed amendments to categorisation of residential zonings are proposed to reflect amendments to the Core Strategy and these are of relevance to subject lands. See proposed amendments NO. 4.2.3.12, NO. 4.2.3.15, NO. 4.2.3.16, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill and NO. 1.2.12 Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend site so that an area of land within CT-GC-06, containing dwelling house and storage yard are rezoned as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Emer O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP345939576</b>	DCDP345939576
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to land designated CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill. Submitter believes this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive in size as there are already huge sites

	zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Eoin Bell</b>
<b>DCDP345920367</b>	DCDP345920367
<b>Submission Summary</b>	In addition to Submission reference DCDP345878205 ensure the request to designate Belvelly as an Architectural Conservation Area is in the text.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Proposal to designate Belvelly as an Architectural Conservation Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It has not been determined by the Heritage section of the Council that Belvelly meets the criteria for designation as an Architectural Conservation Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Eoin Bell</b>
<b>DCDP345878205</b>	DCDP345878205
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission supports the inclusion of Belvelly Bridge as a National Monument and recommendation to include Belvelly Bridge within the Record of Protected Structures (RPS).</p> <p>Detailed architectural and historical background information, relevant to Belvelly Bridge, is provided. An overview of relevant current legislation is also submitted.</p> <p>It is requested that Belvelly be considered as an Architectural Conservation Area and designated a Heritage Village before it is too late.</p> <p>The R624 is more than a conduit for traffic, it is a road where families live, work and play, go for walks and enjoy the scenic beauty of Belvelly and Belvelly Stone Arched Bridge, Belvelly Castle and the SPA and SAC protected tidal estuary. Noise and road/pedestrian safety concerns on the R624 are raised including traffic speed, traffic volume/congestion, narrowness of the road for people and for HGV/buses/coaches, and that the road is not fit for purpose to serve the Port of Cork. Delays and traffic congestion could also adversely impact tourism in Cobh and Spike Island. A new road serving the Port of Cork and Greater Cobh, and re-routed away from the Heritage Village of Belvelly, is requested.</p> <p>Specific wording amendments are requested to Table 2.5.1 Scenic Routes to include reference to views to and the North Channel SAC and SPA, Belvelly Castle, Belvelly Martello Tower, Belvelly bridge, Manning Martello Tower(all protected structures) and Fota.</p> <p>Amendments to the map in Volume 7 is requested to recognise Belvelly Bridge as the designated starting point of the A53 Cobh Scenic Route.</p>

	<p>Belvelly residents require their Right of Way over Fota Estate lands to the Fota Train station to be protected and recognised in the Development Plan. This right of way in use since 1860. Relevant excerpts from the Development Plan are listed that are considered to support Belvelly residents request to have the right of way protected.</p> <p>Relevant text and objectives in the Draft Plan that would support the residents request for a bus stop in Belvelly are also listed in the submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road safety at Belvelly and capacity of R624</li> <li>2. Belvelly bridge should be on the RPS</li> <li>3. ACA and heritage village designation for Belvelly</li> <li>4. Right of way to Fota Train Station</li> <li>5. Bus stop at Belvelly</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road safety is an issue that is outside the remit of the County Development Plan. However, it would be expected that a shift to sustainable transport, with increased levels of active travel and public transport, in line with the objectives of Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility, should lead to increased road safety. The upgrade of the R624 is supported in this plan in line with its identification in the Southern RSES as a key national enabler. It is proposed to amend objective TM 12-12 of chapter 12 Transport and Mobility to highlight the ecological sensitivity of the location relative to the Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC. See proposed amendments NO. 1.12.45 and NO. 1.12.46, Volume 2, Part 1 of this report.</li> <li>2. Noted. Belvelly bridge, Triple- arch hump-bank road bridge built in 1803 over Belvelly Channel, features in the Record of Protected Structures in the Draft Plan.</li> <li>3. It has not been determined by the Heritage section of the Council that Belvelly meets the criteria for designation as an Architectural Conservation Area. The County Development Plan does not feature a 'heritage village' designation category. However, the objectives of chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage, in particular, and Volume 2 Heritage and Amenity, afford protection to built and cultural heritage.</li> <li>4. Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.</li> <li>5. The provision of a bus stop at Belvelly is outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend objective TM 12-12 of chapter 12 Transport and Mobility to highlight the ecological sensitivity of the location relative to the Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Felim and Máire Keegan</b>
<b>DCDP345905692</b>	DCDP345905692
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Welcomes recognition of the need to facilitate access to local services and provision of enhanced community amenities within Glounthaune and is pleased with the recognition of the huge importance of a plan of connectivity and sustainability for the community as a whole.

	<p>Raises concern regarding traffic congestion at the local school and dangerous driving conditions along the narrow local country roads.</p> <p>States that there is an ongoing problem of local flooding arising from a greater catchment area together with poor road camber and inadequate storm drainage which needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Sees sense in providing new housing in the lower locations of Glounthaune so as to provide ease of access and connectivity to public transport. States that the location and designation of critical amenities is vital - such as maximising the benefit of the local rail service and provision of sports and leisure facilities.</p> <p>Sees that the plan is an opportunity to incorporate consideration of all age and ability persons.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road safety and traffic congestion.</li> <li>2. Support for the provision of enhanced community amenities.</li> <li>3. Local flooding, poor road camber and inadequate storm drainage.</li> <li>4. Support for provision of new housing in lower locations with connectivity to public transport.</li> <li>5. Opportunity to incorporate consideration of all age and ability persons</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road safety is an issue that is outside the remit of the County Development Plan. However, it would be expected that a shift to sustainable transport, with increased levels of active travel and public transport, in line with the objectives of Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility, should lead to increased road safety. The Plan recognises, as mentioned in the submission, the need for enhanced connectivity.</li> <li>2. The support for the provision of enhanced community amenities is noted.</li> <li>3. Chapter Water Management contains an objective regarding Surface Water and SuDS (WM 11-10) to provide adequate storm water infrastructure in order to accommodate the planned levels of growth expected for the County.</li> <li>4. Support for provision of new housing in lower locations with connectivity to public transport is noted.</li> <li>5. Objective SC 6-2: Social and Community Engagement of Chapter 6 recognise the diversity of needs of all citizens of various life stages, cultural and ethnic minorities, and ensure all have the opportunity to contribute to the development of their communities. an amendment is proposed (Amendment No. 1.6.3) to include that the Planning Authority will continue to actively engage with all citizens in order to encourage involvement in their community so people have a voice in the decisions that affect their quality of life in their county, where appropriate.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Chapter 6 as per Amendment No. 1.6.3, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 6
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fitzgerald Family</b>
<b>DCDP346220092</b>	DCDP346220092

<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to a site outside of and adjoining the development boundary of Glounthaune and seeks its inclusion within the development boundary and its zoning as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. The land currently contains one dwelling which it submits is an inefficient use of serviceable lands, and it is proposed that rezoning of the land will facilitate the possibility of providing additional dwellings. States that other properties within the development boundary are more remote from the village core and/or more prominent than subject lands. States that subject land is a crossroads which has existing dwelling houses in all four quadrants.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for the inclusion of additional land within the development boundary of Glounthaune to deliver the level of growth identified for the settlement?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is ample land within the development boundary of Glounthaune to deliver the level of growth identified for the settlement. Rural housing policy of the Plan will apply to any applications on subject land.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Frank Hannigan</b>
<b>DCDP333560632</b>	DCDP333560632
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to the CT-R-18 (residential zoning) and CT-U-10 (Pedestrian and cycle bridge) zonings in Carrigtwohill. Key points raised include the following:</p> <p>In relation to the CT-R-18 it submits that development here will consist of starter homes with owners that will not commit to the community. It raises concerns regarding the scale of potential development. It submits that such development would not contribute to the ambition for Carrigtwohill as an attractive place. It finds that a development of a similar density to existing development at Bog Rd would be more sustainable. It raises concerns regarding impacts of potential development on the value of existing properties. It raises the issue of loss of habitat from developing the greenfield site. While it supports sustainable transport it submits that car ownership in Carrigtwohill is necessary and will continue and that CT-R-18 zoning would only make sense if car ownership was close to zero. It raises issues of lack of pedestrian connectivity in the area and inadequacy of the road in coping with current traffic volumes. It highlights the heritage value of attractive stone walls along the road. It states that the land and the road serving it have been subject to flooding in recent years.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the draft plan allow for sufficient diversity of housing types in Carrigtwohill?</li> <li>2. Is the density proposed for the CT-R-18 site, and the scale of the site, appropriate?</li> <li>3. Is the CT-U-10 zoning appropriate?</li> <li>4. Is an increase in sustainable transport use achievable in Carrigtwohill and the CT-R-18?</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. How are features of the built heritage, such as stone walls of Bog Rd. protected?</li> <li>6. Is the proposed zoning appropriate from a flood risk perspective?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Geaney Properties Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345919848</b>	DCDP345919848
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to a land parcel at Killacloyne, Carrigtwohill which includes part of CT-B-02 and additional land outside of the development boundary. The submission seeks the inclusion of the remaining part of Geaney Properties Ltd land to the west to be brought in to the overall designation and consequently within the Carrigtwohill Development Boundary.



	Specific wording amendments are also requested to zoning objective CT-B-02 associated with buffering/screening requirements to the SPA and the SAC and correcting the reference to existing scrub woodland habitat from the eastern area of the site to the northern area of the site.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it appropriate to extend the development boundary of Carrigtwohill at this location to include additional employment land?</li> <li>2. Is clarification/correction of CT-B-02 objective wording regarding buffering and screening required?.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that there is significant land zoned for employment use in Carrigtwohill. The additional lands proposed for inclusion within the development boundary overlap with an area identified as being zone A flood risk. They also overlap with Great Island Channel Proposed Natural Heritage Area.</li> <li>2. Treelines and hedgerows on the northern boundary of this zone create a visual screen to the estuary and shall be retained and protected. It is proposed to amend the objective wording to reference to this. As the northern, western and southern boundaries of CT-B-02 adjoin the SAC it would be incorrect to suggest that the buffer would only apply at the western boundary. See proposed amendment NO. 4.2.3.21, Volume 2, Part 2 of this report.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the text of objective CT-B-02 to refer to treelines and hedgerows on the northern boundary of this zone which create a visual screen to the estuary that shall be retained and protected..
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gerard Moore</b>
<b>DCDP333978351</b>	DCDP333978351
<b>Submission Summary</b>	To have the right of way known as the 21 Ditches near Cobh included in the County Plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should the Plan identify specific rights of way?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gerry Deane</b>
<b>DCDP346039127</b>	DCDP346039127
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that the site is retained within the development boundary for Carrigtwohill and that the site's land use should be retained as either Existing Built Up Area or provided with Business Use zoning. Further they request that the green infrastructure mapping is amended to reflect the area of land required to provide for the future greenway only.</p> <p>The subject site is triangular in shape is approximately three hectares and is located in the townland of Killacloyne, Carrigtwohill, approximately mid-way between Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>The Cork County Development Plan (2014) (CDP) and the Cobh Municipal District Local Area Plan (2017) (LAP) includes the subject lands within the settlement boundary of Carrigtwohill. The lands to the west of the site are part of the Metropolitan Greenbelt and are part of the Great Island Channel Special</p>

	<p>Area of Conservation (SAC). The LAP zones the lands as 'Existing Built up Area' which extends east of the lands. To the south the land is zoned as 'Business', to the north the land is zoned as 'Industry'. Part of the lands are within Flood Zone A within the existing LAP and the proposed Draft County Development Plan (Draft CDP).</p> <p>Carrigtwohill is designated a Strategic Employment Location by the draft CDP. They consider that the subject site would provide a sustainable, accessible employment location by merit of its proximity to Carrigtwohill town centre (2.6km), Glounthaune Village (2.3km) and being near both train stations in Glounthaune (2km) and Carrigtwohill (2.3km). Further it would be near the proposed railway station provided for as part of zoning objective CT-B-07. They note that Compulsory Purchase Orders have been issue by Cork County Council for a proposed greenway which would be sited along the south western boundary of the site. This provides for future connection to Carrigtwohill railway station.</p> <p>They note that there is no history of flooding at the subject site confirmed by the owner and the Past Flood Event Area Summary Report (attached at appendix 1 of the submission).</p> <p>They refer to the Draft CDP and note the flooding mapping is intended to be indicative only and that Objective WM 11-15 requires Site Specific Flood Risk Assessments.</p> <p>It is considered that given the zoning objectives proposed for the adjoining landholdings, north, east and south of the site, the subject site would be entirely severed from the existing agricultural landholding.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it appropriate to extend the development boundary of Carrigtwohill at this location to include additional employment land?</li> <li>2. Is clarification required regarding Green Infrastructure figures in the Plan</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that there is significant land zoned for employment use in Carrigtwohill. The consideration of additional employment land is premature pending completion of a business land availability study within 2 years of the adoption of the plan. The additional lands proposed for inclusion within the development boundary overlap with an area identified as being zone A flood risk. See key issue regarding employment land in Volume 1, Part 1.</li> <li>2. Green infrastructure mapping is diagrammatic in nature and is not zoning – see proposed amendment 1.14.23 to Chapter 14 to clarify this.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed in relation to submission however see Proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 1, Green Infrastructure.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gerry Moore</b>
<b>DCDP339477636</b>	DCDP339477636
<b>Submission Summary</b>	A detailed route proposal regarding the provision of a bus service from Cobh to Carrigtwohill and within Cobh town is outlined, highlighting the potential to serve Belvelly, including provision of a change over point to the Cork service . The submission emphasises linkage to the waterfront area of the town.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The need to appropriately expand the bus service in Cobh.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Objective TM 12.5.3 supports key Bus Transport initiatives as follows: TM 12.5.3 b) Promote improvements to existing bus services and generally encourage the enhancement of service provision in tandem with planned population growth; TM 12.5.3 c) Promote the introduction of new bus services on routes where they can offer a direct alternative to the routes most popular with private car users. The implementation of this is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Glounthaune Carrigtwohill Community member</b>
<b>DCDP346006937</b>	DCDP346006937
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to the CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill and expresses opposition to this area being used for large scale industrial development.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Glounthaune Community Association</b>
<b>DCDP346183546</b>	DCDP346183546
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submitters state that they are pleased that the blanket zoning for residential has been removed and there is an enlarged area by the school zoned for amenities GN-C-01. States that increased facilities for the community are required and that suitable land for amenities for the community is scarce. Seeks that extra land be zoned adjacent to the Erin's Own facilities in Caherlag, noting that there are more under 8s in Erin's Own than there are in Mallow GAA, a much larger catchment. Submits that the new proposed road connection (U-01) should be reconsidered and used only as a Cycleway/pathway. Suggests that the top strip of a site it outlines in red (on which there is a currently undecided application for an Independent Living Scheme) be extended as Existing / Mixed Residential zoning to facilitate additional dwelling house units. Notes that the draft plan for Carrigtwohill added a large industrial area (CT-I-01) right up to the borders of Glounthaune, submitting that this is hugely inappropriate, removes any greenbelt between the two villages, and promotes sprawl. Notes a recent submission with regard to lands at Killacloyne, within the development boundary of Carrigtwohill, quite close to Harper's Island, to seek an extension to the west of a site zoned for business (CT-B-02). Suggests strongly that this be refused in the light of proximity to Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Need for increased community facilities and support for GN-C-01 zoning.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Extension of Erin's Own at Caherlag.</li> <li>3. GN-U-01 to be Cycleway/pathway.</li> <li>4. Is it appropriate to amend the development boundary of Glounthaune?</li> <li>5. Is the Carrigtwohill CT-I-01 zoning extent appropriate?</li> <li>6. Is an extension of Carrigtwohill CT-B-02 appropriate?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The need for increased facilities for community use in Glounthaune is acknowledged in the Plan and support for same is noted.</li> <li>2. It is not proposed to zone land in the greenbelt - Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses.</li> <li>3. Objective GN-U-01 is for a Cycleway/pathway and is described as such in the objective text - the corresponding paragraph text in the Plan is to be corrected to reflect this. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.8.4, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> <li>4. There is sufficient land within the development boundary of Glounthaune to meet the growth target identified in the plan and it is not proposed to amend the development boundary.</li> <li>5. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>6. Concern is noted. It is considered that there is significant land zoned for employment use in Carrigtwohill. The consideration of additional employment land is premature pending completion of a business land availability study within 2 years of the adoption of the plan. The additional lands proposed for inclusion within the development boundary overlap with an area identified as being zone A flood risk. They also overlap with Great Island Channel Proposed Natural Heritage Area. See Key issue, Employment Land, Volume 1 of this report.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>Amend the text of Glounthaune so that the reference to GN-U-01 refers to pedestrian and cycle use as per objective text. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</p> <p>See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill regarding CT-I-01</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Glounthaune Sustainable Development</b>
<b>DCDP346293335</b>	DCDP346293335
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Broadly welcomes the content of the proposed local area plan put forward for Glounthaune village including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The removal of blanket zoning for residential.</li> <li>2. Targeted areas for development close to better transport links and rezoning of certain lands.</li> <li>3. The provision of the enlarged area by the school zoned for amenities.</li> <li>4. The support of development but acknowledgement of the significant development that has already occurred and that increased facilities for the community are required.</li> <li>5. The replacement of a future road U-01 running through The Woods by a</li> </ol>

	<p>proposed footpath and cycle path only.</p> <p>6. The uniqueness of the landscape assets of Glounthaune including it's hedgerows, mature trees, woodlands and other habitats and that these need to be protected.</p> <p>It requests that the following comments be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In addition to the allowance of amenity land by the school, allowance should be provided also to the east of Glounthaune adjacent to the lower road and The Woods, Johnstown, Gort Fada and Harper Creek developments.</li> <li>2. The Ashbourne should be zoned for mixed use including Town Centre/Neighbourhood Centre and Community.</li> <li>3. It should be a specific requirement that additional development must be tied to provision of facilities so all parties are invested in their delivery.</li> <li>4. Development of water supply to Glounthaune is constrained by the condition of the existing piping infrastructure and its material of construction. This needs to be addressed as Irish Water restricts the water pressure in certain areas due to the poor condition of the distribution infrastructure.</li> </ol> <p>Asks for the removal of the CT-I-01 zoning in Carrigtwohill for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expanded settlement boundary would be located approximately 150 metres from Glounthaune development boundary and the strategic separation between settlements would be eroded resulting in continuous sprawl.</li> <li>• The greenbelt providing distinct separation between the two areas would be lost.</li> <li>• Consideration of the traffic impacts</li> </ul> <p>Adds that the Carrigtwohill settlement boundary should stop at the Springhill road at Killacloyne; that sufficient industrial land is already zoned in Little Island, Carrigtwohill IDA park, Tullagreen and at the former 'Amgen' site at Ballyadam which is fully serviced; and that consideration should be given to dispersing the industrial zoned land to others areas of the County in the interest of balanced development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Broadly supports approach to zonings, environment references, community facility requirement references.</li> <li>2. Need for community facilities.</li> <li>3. Need to correct reference to GN-U-01 intext to reflect objective wording.</li> <li>4. Amenity proposed at Ashbourne House site.</li> <li>5. Should additional development be tied to provision of facilities?</li> <li>6. Water supply distribution infrastructure.</li> <li>7. Concern regarding CT-I-01 zoning.</li> <li>8. Exclusion of some employment zonings in Carrigtwohill and redistribution elsewhere.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support noted.</li> <li>2. Need for community facilities is reflected in Plan.</li> <li>3. Objective GN-U-01 is for a Cycleway/pathway and is described as such in the objective text - the corresponding paragraph text in the Plan is to</li> </ol>

	<p>be corrected to reflect this. See proposed amendment, NO. 4.2.8.4, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. It is considered however that the site has the potential to provide a small scale community or recreation use which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD</li> <li>5. Zoning provision is made for the provision of community facilities. It is not considered appropriate in this case to tie their delivery to the development of other sites.</li> <li>6. Water supply distribution infrastructure is the responsibility of Irish Water and is outside the remit of the CDP.</li> <li>7. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill regarding CT-I-01</li> <li>8. See above in relation to CT-I-01. No amendments are proposed to CT-B-01 or CT-B-02. A significant quantum of employment land is justified in Carrigtwohill given the opportunity for sustainable development and integrated transport and land use planning derived from the rail offering. It is intended that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan the Planning Authority will complete an employment land availability study.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>Amend the text of Glounthaune so that the reference to GN-U-01 refers to pedestrian and cycle use as per objective text. See proposed amendment, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</p> <p>Amend GN-R-01 specific objective.</p> <p>See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill regarding CT-I-01</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Goldenville Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346129734</b>	DCDP346129734
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to the LI-I-05 zoning at Wallingstown, Little Island, formerly part of the Mitsui Denman site.</p> <p>It requests the removal of text from the zoning objective referencing the protection of the biodiversity value of the site and the proximity of the Cork Harbour Special Protection Area submitting that such wording is too prescriptive, is not accurate and would impact on the deliverability of these lands.</p> <p>It also requests that employment, warehousing, logistics and transportation uses are added to the list of acceptable uses within the LI-I-05 objective.</p> <p>Sets out site context including locational context and history of site stating wastewater lagoons were part of the wastewater treatment of the previous industrial use of the site and that the remediation and restoration of the site following the closure of the previous industrial use required the decommissioning of these lagoons, under the terms of the IPC licence. Makes reference to an application for an extension of duration to a planning permission for an E-Park (comprising 3 data centres) on adjoining lands to the north. Sets out Planning Policy context including reference to the NPF, the RSES</p>

	<p>for the Southern Region, the 2014 CDP, (and its identification of Little Island as a Strategic Employment Location), the 2017 Cobh MD LAP and the Draft Plan (making reference to LI-I-05, LI-U-06 and ZU 18-16).</p> <p>Submits that the vast majority of the LI-I-05 specific objective focusses on biodiversity and natural heritage of the site/area and submits that this does not reflect the brownfield and former and continued industrial use of the site. States that there are no 'Lakes, Ponds, Grassland or Woodland' located within the site. Submits that the reference to Cork Harbour SPA within the specific objective is unnecessary and that protective measures to the Cork Harbour SPA applies to all industrial sites in Little Island. Submits that the LI-I-05 objective limits the potential of the site.</p> <p>Submits that the brownfield site is strategically located adjacent to existing employment facilities, benefits from excellent vehicular and pedestrian connections, is readily accessible and infrastructure to the site will be improved through the Dunkettle Interchange upgrades.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is a more general employment zoning appropriate for LI-I-05?</li> <li>2. Does the text in relation to biodiversity and habitat require updating in light of most recent data?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site is zoned for industry in the Plan. It is felt that, even with a significant modal shift away from use of the private car, a more general employment zoning to also accommodate business use would have a higher impact on traffic in the area than an industrial use and would risk undermining the Dunkettle upgrade project currently underway.</li> <li>2. The land in question lies on the western side of Little Island adjacent to Lough Mahon. The shoreline adjoining the site forms part of the Cork Harbour SPA. From an ecological perspective, it will be important to ensure that development which is permitted at this site does not impact negatively on Lough Mahon or on the Cork Harbour SPA. It is considered appropriate to reflect that in the zoning objective. As habitats within the site itself have been significantly altered the objective may be amended to remove the reference to habitats of county importance. The protection of remnant habitats of ecological value within the site is covered by LI-GO-04 and by policy outlined in Chapter 15 Biodiversity. See Proposed amendment NO. 4.2.5.2, Vol 2, Part 2, of this report.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the text of objective LI-I-05 to remove the reference to habitats of county importance while retaining reference to SPA.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Greener Families Unlimited Company</b>
<b>DCDP345835910</b>	DCDP345835910
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land zoned LI-I-02 adjoining Courtstown Industrial Estate, Little Island.</p> <p>Requests that the specific zoning for the site is maintained and protected in the Plan.</p> <p>States that there is a strategic need for medium-scale waste recovery facilities to serve the Cork region. Makes reference to ZU 3-7(b) of the 2014 CDP</p>



	regarding the provision of strategic large-scale waste treatment facilities including waste to energy recovery facilities and requests the scale of operations be changed from large scale to medium scale in any revised objectives relevant to the LI-I-02.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports LI-I-02 zoning.</li> <li>2. Is an amendment to ZU-18-16 Industrial Areas to specify medium scale in addition to large scale required?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. As stated in objective ZU-18-16, subject to local considerations, civic amenity sites and waste transfer stations may be suitable on industrial sites. Applications for medium scale waste treatment facilities will be considered on their merits as part of the Development Management process.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Heather Cantwell</b>
<b>DCDP345974981</b>	DCDP345974981
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits that the CT-I-01 zoning in Carrigtwohill is the wrong proposal and is excessive as there are already large sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the vacant Amgen site.</p> <p>Proposes that this area should be focusing on the development of community amenities to support the building of new housing/population in this area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> <li>2. Is the area of CT-I-01 suitable for community facilities?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>2. There is land zoned in Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill for the provision of community facilities that is more proximate to those village/town centres and therefore more appropriate than this site</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Henry Browne</b>
<b>DCDP346224577</b>	DCDP346224577
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission outlines comments and proposals in relation to the GN-C-01 and GN-R-01 zonings in Glounthaune and the CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-land zoned for community use in Glounthaune is located at the western edge of the village area while most new housing is at the eastern edge, 1.3km away. It is at 90m elevation and separated from the current village core. It is inaccessible without a car due to current infrastructure. Locating it at the very edge of the village area with little through traffic, makes it more susceptible to anti-social behaviour in the future.</li> <li>-the historic gardens of Ashbourne, which are at the very centre of the village area and would be ideal for community purposes, are zoned for housing. Ashbourne House and Gardens should be zoned for community use.</li> <li>-the green belt zone to the east of Glounthaune has been significantly reduced by zoning additional lands in Killahora for business/ industrial purposes. This</li> </ul>

	green belt zone was specifically designed in previous LAPs to ensure that Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill remain as distinct villages/ towns. The green belt gap has been reduced to just 200m at some points. The extended business/ industrial zone is also located on a scenic route (S42) which cannot accommodate industrial traffic and must be protected. The green belt should be returned to the boundaries defined in the LAP. Includes diagrammatic illustrations.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the GN-C-01 zoning appropriate?</li> <li>2. Is a community use appropriate for Ashbourne House and Gardens?</li> <li>3. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> <li>2. The GN-C-01 zoning is also to accommodate future expansion of the school and is appropriately located beside the existing school. Also, location of community facilities beside the school would optimise their use. The need for a pedestrian/cycle link between the school and village centre/residential developments is noted in the plan. The Ashbourne House site is considered suitable for residential development particularly as it is close to the rail station. In consideration of the sensitivity of the Ashbourne House site and its potential amenity value it is felt that small scale community or recreation use is appropriate for this site which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. This will assist in delivering the 10 minute town concept. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> <li>3. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill. Amend GN-R-01 to include provision of small scale community or recreation use.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ian Bradfield</b>
<b>DCDP345821742</b>	DCDP345821742
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land designated CT-I-01 in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Submits that this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jack O'Connor Island Gate</b>
<b>DCDP343542565</b>	DCDP343542565
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to a 0.23Ha site, comprising a long-established business, and an extensive wider area that contains the site, north of Little Island, the N25, and

	<p>the rail line, and within the Metropolitan Greenbelt in the 2014 County Development Plan and in the Draft CDP.</p> <p>States that the wider area contains a defined, dense, built up area with a mix of uses and that it benefits from the newly constructed Bury's Bridge to Carrigtwohill cycleway. Seeks inclusion of this area, including subject site, within the development boundary of Little Island and zoning as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses', optimising recent infrastructure investments in the area. States that the subject lands are suitable for infill and residential development as an alternative to one off housing in a rural hinterland, and states that they are serviced, contiguous with the built up area of Little Island and benefit from excellent vehicular, rail and pedestrian connections to same.</p> <p>Sets out additional context of subject site – close to city and Glounthaune, Little Island train station and Rockgrove industrial estate. Gives an overview of planning policy, referencing NPF national growth targets and compact growth objectives; referencing the 2014 CDP objectives for Land Uses Within Metropolitan Greenbelt, for Long Established Uses (within the greenbelt), and for Existing Built Up Areas. Also references the Draft CDP objective Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate/necessary to amend the greenbelt to exclude this site?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not considered appropriate to exclude this land from the greenbelt - Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Barrett</b>
<b>DCDP346280037</b>	DCDP346280037
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to the CT-I-01 industrial zoning in Carrigtwohill to which the submitter objects.</p> <p>States that it is essential that these fields remain agricultural/ green belt to act as a buffer and to prevent urban sprawl between Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>States that the topography is steep to the north of the proposed zoned area and would not lend itself to industrial use. States that it's open, highly visual, scenic landscape, which will become a more appreciated amenity when the cycle way is completed between Carrigtwohill and Glounthuane, and which would be adversely affected by the zoning to industrial use.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Barrett</b>
<b>DCDP346280827</b>	DCDP346280827
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Largely supports the plan as it relates to Glounthaune, including the extension of the greenbelt within Glounthaune at Annmount and the extension of community facilities at the school - GN-C-01.</p> <p>Proposes that Ashbourne Gardens and House GN-R-01 should be zoned as mixed use for community and residential with retention of the gardens.</p> <p>States that the present application by Barlow Properties showed how important these gardens are and that the Local Area Plan should reflect this. Outlines that there are more Champion and Heritage Trees per acre than anywhere else in the country. Finds blanket residential zoning applied to the whole 6 acres to be unacceptable given the historic importance of the gardens.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Largely support the plan as it relates to Glounthaune.</li> <li>2. Proposes that Ashbourne Gardens and House GN-R-01 should be zoned as mixed use for community and residential with retention of the gardens.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. It is proposed to reduce the approximate net developable area of the GN-R-01 zoning to reflect the significance of the wooded gardens around Ashbourne House. It is also proposed to strengthen the requirement for protection of the trees in the objective of the site. Given the need to protect the trees and the corresponding appropriate net housing area the site has limited potential for a mix of uses. It is considered however that the site has the potential to provide a small scale community or recreation use which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>Amend GN-R-01 to afford greater protection of trees, to provide a small scale community or recreation use, and provide for a reduced footprint, higher density residential development. See related proposed amendment regarding inclusion of additional land within zoning.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Forde</b>
<b>DCDP345240741</b>	DCDP345240741
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to a 1.9Ha site at Coole East, Whites Cross, located in the Metropolitan Greenbelt and requests that the site be zoned for residential development. Sets out that the land is located in a 50KPH zoned between two residential developments; that if the land was rezoned the landowner would upgrade/replace the existing treatment plant to improve capacity and eliminate environmental impact; that water supply is available; and that safe sightlines are achievable. Outlines national housing shortage and lack of options available</p>

	for local young people looking to remain living in the area, stating that locals have contacted the landowner regarding potential sites.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate/necessary to amend the greenbelt to exclude this site?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not considered appropriate to exclude this land from the greenbelt. Rural housing policy will apply to any applications on this site. As outlined in the Draft Plan, new guidelines on rural housing are awaited and are expected in Q4 2021. The plan will be varied as necessary to comply with the updated Guidelines. See discussion in relation to Chapter 5 Rural Volume One Part One of this report dealing with Key Issues, Responses and Recommendations.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Forde</b>
<b>DCDP345210546</b>	DCDP345210546
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is a duplicate of submission ref DCDP345240741.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See DCDP345240741
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See DCDP345240741
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See DCDP345240741
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James O' Connor</b>
<b>DCDP345857220</b>	DCDP345857220
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that the re-zoning of Land designated CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill does not make sense due to the new pedestrian and cycle path considerably narrowing the road.  Submits that the Amgen site is currently vacant and there is already significant industrial zoning in Carrigtwohill and Little Island.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James O Donoughue</b>
<b>DCDP345796653</b>	DCDP345796653
<b>Submission Summary</b>	An 8 acre site located to the west of Knockraha is identified on a map attached to the submission. It is stated that the 2 designated amenity spaces in the Knockraha development boundary, C-03 and C-01 are not available to the community and will not be into the future.  It is requested that the 8 acre site be zoned for residential use with an amenity/community purpose to benefit the village and that the site would form a natural extension to the Glenmore Heights estate.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is it necessary to amend the development boundary of Knockraha to include additional land for residential development?

	2. Is it necessary to amend the development boundary of Knockraha to include additional land for amenity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. Due to the deficiency of water services in Knockraha a growth level of 10 residential units has been identified for the Plan period. There is ample land within the development boundary to accommodate this and it is not necessary to amend it.</p> <p>2. A site zoned GA-01, proximate to the school and existing residential development is considered to be the most suitable site for the provision of active open space. Issues of site availability can change and as such it is the locational etc. suitability of the site for the land use proposed that has determined the zoning of this site. C-01 has been zoned for an extension of the existing school and as such is best located beside the school. C-02 has been zoned for an extension/upgrade of the existing community building and as such is best located beside the community building.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jean Kelly</b>
<b>DCDP346247665</b>	DCDP346247665
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to land zoned CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill. Submitter believes this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade with main works already completed there. States that the infrastructure is inadequate and the surrounding environments are already polluted and that there would be an impact to the wildlife and natural habitats in those areas. Adds that there have been three housing estates in the last decade and now to turn the remaining surrounding lands into industrial sites would be completely unacceptable.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jim Shealy</b>
<b>DCDP345355601</b>	DCDP345355601
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission raises the issue of access to Battery Strand, Bishop Roche Park Cobh stating that this public amenity has been blocked off from public use for over five years.</p> <p>States that numerous appeals to have it reopened have been made to Cobh Town Council and the Municipal District Council to no avail, stating that many excuses are put forward for having it closed off mostly relating to health and safety grounds. States that now people are told it is due to lack of finances and states that high figures for cost of remedial work have been circulated to public representatives.</p> <p>Notes that the amenity has been used for generations of Cobh families, detailing several purposes. States that if there is a danger there, which it</p>

	<p>queries, it needs to be addressed, regardless of costs.</p> <p>Outlines that there is also an opinion prevalent in Cobh that the strand was closed as it was a site of anti social behavior, stating that this anti social behavior is still in the area. Refers to the irony whereby those who engage in this behavior are able to scale the walls and gain access to the strand while the people who respected and maintained the area are effectively locked out.</p> <p>Submits that a solution to the closure needs to be found immediately and the present position remedied.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of access to strand.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jim Shealy</b>
<b>DCDP345360145</b>	DCDP345360145
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission raises the issue of access to public strands at Connolly Street and Whitepoint, Cobh, particularly for those with disabilities or Senior Citizens. Notes that at Connolly Street, close to the Bench area there is a public walkway down towards the strand, but that at the bottom of the walkway there is a drop to the foreshore of 222pprox..18 inches and some rough terrain to the fore, denying anyone with limited agility or with a pram access to the strand. States that this strand has become very much used during lock down and that, with sewage works coming to completion, it has the potential to become a favourite bathing area, as it was in the past.</p> <p>Refers to the western end of Whitepoint , where a well used public walkway onwards to Blackpoint and Pebble Beach exists stating that the concrete path which leads to the strand is badly eroded over the years and that the steps leading down to the strand are disturbed by tides and in a dangerous and precarious condition. Submitter has observed elderly people denied access to the beach due to their inability to use the damaged steps.</p> <p>Submits that neither of these issues would cost much to remedy and would mean so much to many people.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of access to strand.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joe O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP343809270</b>	DCDP343809270
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Supports the strategic direction outlined for the Glounthaune area in the Draft Plan stating that, while housing is necessary for the area, designating land close to the railway station for future housing appears very sensible as the new cycleway and pedestrian paths will facilitate easy access by foot or bicycle.</p> <p>States that plans to revise the zoning north of Glounthaune NS also looks very sensible as the school and community need a lot of extra space for school</p>



	<p>expansion, necessary safe parking and areas for community development.</p> <p>From a historic building perspective it welcomes that the Dry Bridge and the original Primary School in the village will get the recognition that its built heritage deserves.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports provision of housing close to rail in Glounthaune.</li> <li>2. Supports GN-C-01 zoning for community facilities and school expansion.</li> <li>3. Supports dry bridge and former primary school RPS inclusion.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John &amp; Catherine Buckley</b>
<b>DCDP346196683</b>	DCDP346196683
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to a 1.63 ha site which is outside and adjoining the development boundary of Whitechurch. Requests that the site is included within the development boundary of Whitechurch. Submits that the land is suitable for development being adjacent to an existing residential estate and bordering an approved planned development which it indicates will facilitate access of subject site to water services. States that rezoning would support infrastructure for sustainable transport modes in the village and lies on direct walking route to school and community centre. Submits that it represents a logical extension of the village and achieves a balance of residential, community and recreational facilities within the village, cohesively joining the village centre with the community hub.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is an extension to the development boundary necessary to meet the growth target of Whitechurch?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is ample land within the development boundary of Whitechurch to meet the growth target identified for the village.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John &amp; Noreen Barrett</b>
<b>DCDP345792174</b>	DCDP345792174
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to land zoned CT-RR-O1 and CT-RR-O2, Residential Reserve, in the Draft Plan with submitter expressing concern at the change to the zoning. Submits that with the current housing crisis situation it should remain as medium residential reserve.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is this land required to meet the growth target for Carrigtwohill identified in the Core Strategy?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient identified in the plan to meet the growth target for Carrigtwohill. Note however that it is proposed to recategorise this land as 'Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development Sites (Further Additional Provision)' as a consequence of amendments to the Core Strategy (see

	proposed amendment NO. 1.2.12). See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.3.17, NO. 4.2.3.18, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Recategorise CT-RR-O1 and CT-RR-O2 as 'Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development Sites (Further Additional Provision)'.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Horgan Snr., John Hogan Jnr., Kieran Horgan, Barry Horgan, Kathy Jean Horgan, Stephen Hyde and Stefan Hyde</b>
<b>DCDP346142998</b>	DCDP346142998
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission states that the CT-U-07 zoning in Carrigtwohill is not a cattle underpass (as described in the Draft Plan) but rather a roadway designed and provided by Iarnród Éireann as a multi functional link in order to replace a level crossing over the permanent way in furtherance of the reopening of the rail service.</p> <p>Welcomes the pedestrian/cycle connectivity function of the link but fears restriction on its use may inhibit future development of the land to the north and the proposed use of the underpass. Submits that it is distant from other pedestrian links and CT-U-12. Submits that restricted use of the link for public service/emergency vehicles could be of benefit. Submits that it is imperative that the route is maintained to ensure travel north to the residentially zoned areas but feels the CT-C-03 zoning would deflect this route a considerable distance. Submits an alternative wording for objective CT-U-07.</p> <p>Submits that the proposed school site CT-C-03 in Carrigtwohill is an unnecessary over provision. Submits that objective CT-C-01 is about to be achieved, that CT-C-04 adequately caters for future needs, and that the 2017 LAP indicated that the proposed school sites shall be subject to review if the requirements for such provision changed during the lifetime of the plan. Requests that such a review is carried out and requests that it is determined that the CT-C-03 is not required.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the CT-C-03 required?</li> <li>2. What is the most appropriate use of the existing underpass at CT-U-07?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department of Education have indicated in their submission to the Plan that the provision for a school (CT-C-03) is necessary.</li> <li>2. To facilitate sustainable travel it is important to maximise connectivity and permeability in Carrigtwohill, in particular connectivity to public transport. It is appropriate that the CT-U-07 be for pedestrian and cycle use only. As per the submission request the description of the existing use of the underpass may be amended. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.3.5., Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, of this report.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend CT-U-07 to exclude reference to cattle in the description of the underpass.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John O Flynn and Michael O Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP345336766</b>	DCDP345336766
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits an image from the Draft Plan Little Island zoning map with submission subject site outlined. States that a proposed new road shown on Draft Plan passes through the NE corner of subject site.</p> <p>Submits that at a pre-planning meeting in Cobh, 19/09/2017, PPE 17/525 to discuss a development of the site, a planner said they were prevented from</p>

	<p>allowing any development on the site due to the road plans shown to cross through the site.</p> <p>Submission states that there is a need to amend the route of the road to avoid subject site as landowners need to develop same immediately. Further states that there is ample space on undeveloped lands to the North of the site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Route of LI-U-02
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	LI-U-02 is necessary as a distributor road. As outlined in the Draft Plan, paragraph 1.4.2, all roads, walks and cycleways routes shown on maps are Indicative.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Punch</b>
<b>DCDP345901216</b>	DCDP345901216
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to a 0.87 Ha site within CH-B-01 zoning in Draft Plan. Seeks to have subject site zoned to facilitate development of a retirement village, if possible with retention of existing business zoning on site.</p> <p>Submits that there is interest from developers for the retirement village and points to Cobh's growing and ageing population.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it necessary to make provision for a nursing home in Cobh and is this an appropriate location for a nursing home?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Provision has been made in the Plan for a nursing home within CH-R-12 as such provision is considered necessary for the town. There is a permission on part of the CH-R-12 and a live application on part also. The developer of CH-R-12 has submitted an opinion that the site is not a suitable location for a nursing home. The subject site within CH-B-01 is similar to CH-R-12 in its distance from the town centre. It is located close to the Ticknock neighbourhood centre, and will be served by CH-U-09 (upgrading of Ticknock Road to include pedestrian and cycle facilities). Alternative land has not been identified closer to the town centre. See proposed amendments NO. 4.2.4.18 and NO. 4.2.4.17</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the text of CH-R-12 to exclude the requirement for a nursing home and amend the zoning map to exclude the subject site from CH-B-01 and to identify it as CH-C-05. Include new specific objective text for CH-C-05 Nursing home.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jonathan Howlett</b>
<b>DCDP345897352</b>	DCDP345897352
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to CT-I-01 zoning in Draft Plan and states that it is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Knockraha Area Community Association Ltd.</b>

<b>DCDP346185427</b>	DCDP346185427
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits that waste water and water supply services in Knockraha should be addressed as a matter of urgency and that the main Street houses in the village should be connected to a waste water treatment plan presently being constructed by developers.</p> <p>Agrees that no more than 10 houses should be built during the plan period and states that consideration should be given to retail and other services.</p> <p>Submits that the provision and extension of footpaths, extending and upgrading of public lighting and undergrounding of services and traffic calming measures should be implemented without delay. Raises road safety issues. States that the proposed new amenity walk to the north of the village, and the speed limit sign, should at least be extended to St. Quanes Well and further north to Kilquane Graveyard.</p> <p>Submits that land zoned C-01 and C-02 is unlikely to be for sale in near future and that the community association has tried unsuccessfully to source alternative land near the village for a playground, pitch, MUGA and sports/community centre. Requests that any future applications for zoning of land near the village should be granted with the proviso that a part of this land should be made available for the facilities listed above.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for water services in Knockraha.</li> <li>2. Development of retail and other services in the village.</li> <li>3. Provision of public lighting, footpaths and other services.</li> <li>4. Extension of U-01.</li> <li>5. Availability of land for community facilities.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of water services in the village is recognised in the Plan.</li> <li>2. Retail and other appropriate services may be considered through the development management process.</li> <li>3. Provision of public lighting, footpaths and other services is an operational matter outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>4. It is proposed to amend the plan to extend U-01. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.12.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Knockraha.</li> <li>5. A site zoned GA-01, proximate to the school and existing residential development is considered to be the most suitable site for the provision of active open space. Issues of site availability can change and as such it is the locational, topographical etc. suitability of the site for the land use proposed that has determined the zoning of this site. C-01 has been zoned for an extension of the existing school and as such is best located beside the school. C-02 has been zoned for an extension/upgrade of the existing community building and as such is best located beside the community building.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Knockraha zoning map to extend U-01 towards Kilquane Graveyard.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Margaret Somers</b>
<b>DCDP346271819</b>	DCDP346271819
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission points out that the CDP will span a time requiring huge lifestyle changes to address the climate change and biodiversity crisis. Points to the need for leadership from the Council in this regard stating that sustainable

	<p>development and biodiversity enhancement should be front and centre of all future planning decisions. Finds the draft plan wordy and lacking in definitive actions or goals.</p> <p>Highlights beauty and uniqueness of Cobh and Great Island. Outlines a number of areas of concern and makes suggestions/comments regarding active travel and biodiversity including the following. 1. Pedestrians/Cyclists: promote pedestrian priority areas, particularly on the Cuskinny Marsh Rd.; specific walking routes on the Island would complement tourism; speed limits in Cobh town need to be reduced; a safe cycleway from Cobh to the ferry would enable commuting from Cobh to Cork; more bike racks needed on the island; the 21 ditches walk should be promoted and rights of way on island should be protected; access to shore should be maintained and, in the case of The Batteries Strand, reinstated; delivering the 10 minute town should be a key factor in making Cobh an attractive liveable town - this requires accommodation in the town such as from living over the shop and it requires a focus on sustainable jobs in addition to tourism and retail. . 2. Biodiversity and Cuskinny Marsh Nature Reserve and Bay: Cuskinny Bay should be preserved; planting of native trees needs to be encouraged; remaining wooded areas on the island such as Keeffe’s wood, Glenmore Glen, need to be protected; areas of Great Island adjoining shore need to be protected due to important habitats (North Channel/Marino points and Carrigaloe mudflats in particular); CDP should make provision for the protection of nesting swifts; hedgerows should be retained and hedge cutting controlled; use of herbicides by the Council and its contractors should be phased out; the Council should sign up to the All Ireland pollinator Plan; light pollution can have adverse impacts on health and environment, and light pollution guidelines should be updated.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sustainable development and biodiversity enhancement should be front and centre of all future planning decisions.</li> <li>2. Identification of rights of way and access to strand.</li> <li>3. Designation of pedestrian priority areas.</li> <li>4. Need for cycle route from Cobh to the ferry service.</li> <li>5. Additional active travel measures such as provision of cycle parking.</li> <li>6. Promotion of 10 minute town.</li> <li>7. Promotion of living over the shop.</li> <li>8. Does the CDP appropriately protect Cuskinny Bay?</li> <li>9. Planting of native trees and habitat protection.</li> <li>10. Protection of areas of The Great Island adjoining the seashore to ensure that any future developments do not adversely affect these important habitats.</li> <li>11. provision for the protection of nesting swifts through the planning process.</li> <li>12. Retention of hedgerows and control of hedge cutting.</li> <li>13. Use of herbicides by the County Council and their contractors.</li> <li>14. Cork County Council should be a partner in the All – Ireland pollinator plan.</li> <li>15. Inappropriate artificial lighting and light pollution. Light pollution guidelines.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The concepts of sustainable development and climate action permeate all aspects of the Plan. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity</li> </ol>

	<p>is a key element of this for which policies and objectives are set out in Chapter 15 Biodiversity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1. The provision of access to public strands is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>3. The plan identifies walkways in settlements and also supports particular cycleways/greenways of strategic importance. The identification of additional specific walkways etc. outside of settlements is outside the remit of the CDP. However, Chapter 10, Tourism and Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility strongly support walking and active travel generally.</li> <li>4. Objective CH-GO-06 is to link inter-urban route IU-1 (CMATS ref) to Cobh Town via Fota Island with a segregated, high-quality pedestrian and cycle facility. This will connect the town to the ferry service.</li> <li>5. TM 12-2 and other objectives Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility provide comprehensive objectives to promote active travel, including cycle parking. Cycle parking standards are also set out in that chapter. The Cobh Public realm enhancement plan includes provision for cycle parking also.</li> <li>6. Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility specifically promotes the 10 minute town. It is also an objective to prepare a Local Transport Plan for Cobh which will assist in delivery of the 10 minute town. See relevant proposed amendments in Volume 2, Part 1, Transport and Mobility.</li> <li>7. Objective PL 3-2 Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places promotes the use of upper floors of the existing town centre building stock for appropriate uses including residential.</li> <li>8. It is considered that Chapter 15 and in particular objective BE 15-2 affords it appropriate protection.</li> <li>9. Policies in the Plan support biodiversity enhancement and the planting of native trees such as Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. In addition, recommendations are made to strengthen the wording in Objective 15-6(c) to require a majority of native trees and plants in the landscaping of new development. Amendments are also recommended to commit to delivering a new County Biodiversity Action Plan which will provide greater detail on community actions and operational matters. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1.15.8, NO. 1.15.8, NO 1.15.1, Volume2, Part 1, Biodiversity.</li> <li>10. Objective BE 15-2 protects sites, habitats and species which are designated or proposed for designation under European legislation, National legislation and International Agreements.</li> <li>11. Swifts are specifically recognised in Volume 2 and Volume 6 of the Plan as a Bird Species of Conservation Concern and Special Conservation Significance Occurring in Cork. Objective BE15-2 requires protection to be provided for species listed in Volume 2 of the Plan. The Policy in relation to wildlife conservation is contained in Volume 1, Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment and refers all wildlife. Specific mention of Swifts is not included in Volume 1 as it seeks to apply to all wildlife, not just Swifts. Amendments are recommended to achieve a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity through objectives in Chapter 15. The</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>Council’s guidelines Council “Biodiversity and the Planning Process”, referred to in Objective BE 15-6, specifically recommends consideration of bird boxes in developments as part of biodiversity mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>12. Cork County Council committed to support the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan in July 2021 and accordingly the Roads Division of the Council will comply with the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan Transport Corridors Guidelines with the aim of protecting hedgerows, treelines and roadside verges. Objective CH-GO-03, Cobh and the objectives of Chapter 15 Biodiversity seek to protect hedgerows.</p> <p>13. The use of insecticides and herbicides is an operational matter (rather than a strategic policy matter for the Development Plan). The new Biodiversity Action Plan is therefore the appropriate place to discuss and adopt changes to the Council’s ‘ways of doing’ in terms of on-the-ground maintenance works.</p> <p>14. Cork County Council committed to support the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan in July 2021.</p> <p>15. See key issue (light pollution) in Biodiversity and Environment Chapter, Volume 1 of this report and See proposed amendments, 1.15.14, 1.15.16, 1.15.17, Volume2, Part 1, Biodiversity to include additional guidance regarding lighting. Objective BE 15-13(d) commits to reviewing and updating Cork County Council’s Policy Guidelines for Public Lighting to take account of impacts of public lighting on wildlife.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>Amend Chapter 12, Transport and Mobility to include new text and clarification regarding Local Transport Plans.</p> <p>Amend Chapter 15 Biodiversity to commit to delivering a new County Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>Amend Chapter 15 Biodiversity to achieve a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity.</p> <p>Amend Chapter 15 Biodiversity to include additional text regarding light pollution.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Marie Dilworth</b>
<b>DCDP344253229</b>	DCDP344253229
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to a 9 acre site outside and adjoining the development boundary of Carrigtwohill at Tullagreen. Refers to growth that has occurred in Carrigtwohill and to established industrial and services related character of the Carrigtwohill area south of the N25 adjoining the subject site. It references new wastewater treatment capacity. It points to a lack of reference in the Draft Plan to the existing developments south of the N25. States that there is adequate road capacity to absorb further development. References CASP update and its listing of indicative employment types best suited to Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>It proposes that the development boundary should be extended to include the subject lands and that they should be zoned for industrial and related uses. States that site is above predicted flood levels and is not susceptible to flooding, and states that there is no SAC designation on the site. It states that, as the site does not have an industrial zoning, a conflict has arisen in terms of</p>



	incompatible land uses in close proximity to each other and calls for a rationalisation of land use in the area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to zone additional land for employment use at Tullagreen, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This site, south of the N25, adjoins Great Island Channel SAC and Great Island Channel pNHA, and is proximate to Cork Harbour SPA. The consideration of additional employment land is premature pending completion of a business land availability study within 2 years of the adoption of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin and Finola Quinlan</b>
<b>DCDP343682779</b>	DCDP343682779
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission commends the approach to the Glounthaune area in the draft development plan 2022-2028. States that the zoning of the area GN-C-01 for community facilities to provide for expansion of the school and recreational facilities is sensible due to the anticipated increase in the population of the locality.</p> <p>Finds the objective of developing residential units close to bus and rail and community centres logical and responsible as further development on the higher grounds is not suitable for large developments due to the lack of infrastructure &amp; facilities. Recognises the value of developing safe pedestrian &amp; cycling pathways near the railway station, bus stop &amp; community centres such as the church, shops etc.</p> <p>Regarding objective GN-R-01, it makes reference to preservation of the existing trees and habitat in the Ashbourne House area, as those gardens are in existence since the early 20th century and are important due to their historic significance to the area.</p> <p>States that recognition of the architectural significance of the Lacken Roe (Dry Bridge) &amp; preservation of same is of key importance to the local community and that it has been synonymous with Glounthaune village since the 1800's.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>Supports the approach to the Glounthaune area in the draft development plan, including GN-C-01.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports objective of developing residential units close to bus and rail and community centres.</li> <li>2. Does not support residential development on the higher grounds due to lack of infrastructure &amp; facilities.</li> <li>3. Recognises the value of developing safe pedestrian &amp; cycling pathways near the railway station, bus stop &amp; community centres.</li> <li>4. Preservation of the existing trees and habitat in the Ashbourne House area - important due to their historic significance to the area.</li> <li>5. Architectural significance of the Lacken Roe (Dry Bridge) &amp; preservation of same is of key importance to the local community.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted. An area of elevated land has been excluded from the development boundary as it is considered that there is ample land to meet the growth target identified for the village on more suitable land, closer to the village centre and the rail.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. Noted. Active Travel objective TM12-2 in Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility supports pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Council has recently developed Bury's Bridge to Carrigtwohill cycleway at this area.</p> <p>4. It is proposed to reduce the approximate net developable area of the GN-R-01 zoning to reflect the significance of the wooded gardens around Ashbourne House. It is also proposed to strengthen the requirement for protection of the trees in the objective of the site. Given the need to protect the trees and the corresponding appropriate net housing area the site has limited potential for a mix of uses. It is considered however that the site has the potential to provide a small scale community or recreation use which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</p> <p>5. Noted. This is included in the RPS.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend GN-R-01 to afford greater protection to trees and to provide a small scale community or recreation use.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Corry</b>
<b>DCDP339626200</b>	DCDP339626200
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is supplementary to submission DCDP332723509 and clarifies the extent of the property referred to in that submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See submission DCDP332723509
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See submission DCDP332723509
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See submission DCDP332723509
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Corry</b>
<b>DCDP332723509</b>	DCDP332723509
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Seeks that consideration be given to the inclusion of property at Eircode T45K076 within the boundary of Glounthaune.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is additional land required to meet the growth target of the settlement?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is ample land within the development boundary to meet the growth target of Glounthaune.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Dorgan</b>
<b>DCDP346286874</b>	DCDP346286874
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land designated CT-I-01 Draft Plan. Strongly objects to this proposal stating that, apart from being an unsightly development on a beautiful green hillside, it would be completely unfitting in this rural setting which is currently farmland and private houses.</p> <p>Submits that Cork County Council should learn from the mistakes they made in Little Island where they destroyed it when they allowed huge</p>

	<p>factories/industrial units amongst a small rural community.</p> <p>Suggests that it would be more fitting to change the planning in this area to allow people to build houses on privately acquired sites and remove the obstacle whereby one has to have been living/born on the land to gain planning permission.</p> <p>Makes reference to Covid and advantages of rural settings and working from home.</p> <p>States that the Council is leaning towards pushing people into buying houses within estates, that everyone is entitled to live where one can afford and above all where one wishes to live, and that not everyone wants to live in Cities or towns.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> <li>2. Should the greenbelt policy be amended?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>2. As outlined in the Draft Plan, new guidelines on rural housing are awaited and are expected in Q4 2021. The plan will be varied as necessary to comply with the updated Guidelines. See discussion in relation to Chapter 5 Rural Volume One Part One of this report dealing with Key Issues, Responses and Recommendations.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary O'Leary</b>
<b>DCDP344293664</b>	DCDP344293664
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits that the issue of a high level of vacant properties in Cobh, as well as homelessness and inability to afford housing, needs to be tackled urgently. Submits that addressing this would revitalise the town as a vibrant community with people living over shops and retrofitting dwellings in line with Government Climate Action policy, and that it would stop urban sprawl and should encourage more use of public transport. States that there should be a monetary incentive for the purchase of second hand homes similar to those for new houses as young people are being squeezed out of the market. Outlines that encouraging and making town living attractive would enhance the town, bring life to the street, and be inline with the Council's Cobh Town Centre Urban Design Plan to greatly improve the public realm of Cobh town centre. The submission includes a link to a newspaper article about the Cobh Town Centre Urban Design Plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation of vibrant communities and addressing high levels of vacancy in Cobh.</li> <li>2. Provision of monetary incentives for purchase of 2<sup>nd</sup> hand homes.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objectives in the Plan, in particular in Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking aim to deliver vibrant, resilient communities. Objective PL 3-2 Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places promotes the use of upper floors of the existing town centre building stock for appropriate uses including residential. Objectives of Chapter 12 Transport and</li> </ol>

	<p>Mobility seek to deliver the 10 minute town – a key element of liveable towns. See also Chapter 9 Town Centre and Retail for additional supporting objectives. As indicated in the submission, the Cobh public realm enhancement plan, supported by the Draft Plan, will significantly increase vibrancy in the town.</p> <p>2. The provision of monetary incentives for purchase of 2<sup>nd</sup> hand homes is outside the remit of the County Development Plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Stack</b>
<b>DCDP345516535</b>	DCDP345516535
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Questions why Ballymore, Carrigaloe and Belvelly are not part of the County Development Plan stating that if no further development is envisaged this should not exclude the rights of these areas to seek improvements to services, environment and recreational needs. Referencing 'Other Locations' in the plan it asks why Belvelly settlement, Belvelly Castle, Martello Tower, estuarine SPA area, and historical coastal walls are not recognised under this category and asks why some elements are not included under Fota Island and SAC areas. States that these coastal walls are being replaced with mass concrete and notice by the Council to protect this bridge should be mentioned.</p> <p>Submits that ongoing development at Fota Island Resort has placed pressure on habitats and ecosystems and also raises concern regarding pedestrian access to Fota Island being under threat.</p> <p>Making reference to the Council's Corporate Plan, and its promises regarding quality of life and sustainable transport, states that the Council is not delivering on its corporate promise with regard to Belvelly, stating that its omission from the Draft Plan leaves Belvelly with no transport services or priority within the Development Plan framework.</p> <p>Suggests that the Council implement 'quiet time' which would see a ban on lawnmowers etc. for a defined number of hours on a Sunday.</p> <p>Requests that Council conservation officer is consulted more in relation to engineering works, making particular reference to sea walls.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improvement of services (including bus services) and recreational needs in areas outside of the settlement hierarchy such as Ballymore, Carrigaloe and Belvelly.</li> <li>2. Protection of ecological habitats and built heritage in areas outside of the settlement hierarchy such as Ballymore, Carrigaloe and Belvelly.</li> <li>3. How can the plan ensure consultation is undertaken with conservation and heritage staff with regard to engineering works?</li> <li>4. Implementation of 'quiet time', banning lawnmowers on a specific day such as one Sunday per month.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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</li> </ol>

	<p>policy applicable in the area. Full detail of the network review is set out in Background Document No. 4 Settlements and Placemaking available at <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a></p> <p>Objectives in the plan support the provision of services to rural areas as appropriate. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility contains objectives to promote sustainable transport including objectives supporting bus transport and Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure recognises the recreation value of green infrastructure and includes objective such as GI 14-7 – Countryside Recreation, to protect same. See also Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Volume 2 of the plan, Heritage and Amenity, contains the record of protected structures which outlines the current Record of Protected Structures for the entire County and includes structures outside of the settlement hierarchy of the Plan. Objectives of Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment, Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage, and other chapters also apply to areas outside of the settlements as well as within the settlements. Objective BE 15-2 of Chapter 15 provides for the protection of sites, habitats and species including the Great Island Channel SAC and Cork Harbour SPA which adjoin Belvelly. Belvelly Bridge is listed in the Record of Protected Structures in the Plan.</li> <li>3. The objectives of the Plan with regard to conservation and heritage apply to all development. Consultation with conservation and heritage staff, with regard to same is undertaken as part of normal development management procedures. However detailed operational procedures are outside the remit of the plan</li> <li>4. The implementation of ‘quiet time’ is outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Mulcahy</b>
<b>DCDP345791400</b>	DCDP345791400
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>States that the submission of Little Island Business Association relates to the area of Little Island and the need for more housing in the area with social facilities for all residents and infrastructure consistent with a growing area.</p> <p>Requests that no further unsuitable commercial development be allowed that will interfere with the overall plan for the area where residents must be treated with greater respect regarding the quality of life that they should be entitled to.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The need for housing and associated development in Little Island should not be undermined by inappropriate commercial development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The need for residential development is recognised in the Plan which seeks to deliver a new sustainable residential neighbourhood. This is to include a small scale, local neighbourhood centre within lands identified for residential development (LI-X-01). The Council does not envisage the residential development being undermined by the provision of inappropriate

	development. It proposed to amend text to clarify the scale of the neighbourhood centre to be provided in LI-X-01. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.8, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend text of objective LI-X-01 to clarify the scale of the neighbourhood centre to be provided in LI-X-01
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mr. Pat O'Connor</b>
<b>DCDP345942823</b>	DCDP345942823
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>It is requested to retain and expand the 2017 Cobh MD LAP development boundary of Carrignavar village and include additional lands to the north of the village within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>A map of the lands is provided in the submission along with a detailed rationale for the proposal including policy, planning and development context. To help reverse the trend of one off housing and the continued decline of small urban settlements within the rural areas, this submission to consolidate and expand the established settlement of Carrignavar should be considered favourably.</p> <p>The submission also refers to inconsistency in development boundaries between the Draft Plan's PDF and web versions and that the 2017 LAP boundaries should be retained.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is an expansion of the development boundary of Carrignavar necessary?</li> <li>2. Inconsistency in development boundaries between the Draft Plan's PDF and web versions.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The growth target for Carrignavar was determined with regard to the lack of waste water infrastructure in the village. There is ample land within the development boundary to meet this target.</li> <li>2. The development boundary of the draft plan is as per the printed/PDF version. The representation of the development boundary of Carrignavar on the web version is incorrect and will be amended so that it reflects the pdf version. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.7.5, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Carrignavar.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the representation of the development boundary of Carrignavar on the web version so that it reflects the pdf version. No proposed amendment to Draft Plan text.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Murnane and O'Shea</b>
<b>DCDP346157917</b>	DCDP346157917
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to lands at Terrysland within the Urban Expansion Area (UEA) of Carrigtwohill, comprising part of CT-GR-01, part of CT C-03, CT-R-02, CT-R-03, and part of CT-R-04.</p> <p>The submission seeks that the residential element of the subject lands, 12.8HA, covered by 3 zoning objectives in the Draft Plan, two of which extend into lands in separate ownership, be re-assigned a singular residential zoning objective, CT-R-03 – Medium A Density, to reflect the existing land ownership boundaries and to facilitate the sustainable and orderly development of the area,</p>

	<p>submitting that this will aid the efficient delivery of these lands in the short term.</p> <p>States that submitters have been actively building houses in Carrigtwohill for almost 20 years, are currently constructing the Elmbury housing development on land to the east of Carrigtwohill, and are well placed to deliver housing within the UEA.</p> <p>Outlines locational context and policy context including reference to 2014 CDP, 2017 Cobh MD LAP and Draft Plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapped representation of CT-R-02, CT-R-03, and CT-R-04</li> <li>2. Appropriate density of CT-R-04</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not proposed to amend the mapped representation/ area of each of the zoned sites CT-R-02, CT-R-03 and CT-R-04</li> <li>2. In line with national policy regarding compact growth and integration of land use and transport planning, it is appropriate that this site, within less than 1km of a rail station, be zoned for high density development. See key issue, density, volume 1 of this report.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed. Note however recommended change arising from Core Strategy amendments to categorisation of CT-R-03 as a Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development (Further Additional Provision) site - PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.3.11, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD of this report and PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1.2.12 of Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Murphy Transport</b>
<b>DCDP345988708</b>	DCDP345988708
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission relates to a zoning anomaly regarding a site in Little Island. Most of the site is zoned as Industry by the draft Development plan namely zoning reference LI-I-01. However, a portion of the site along the eastern boundary has been zoned as Green Infrastructure namely zoning reference LI-GC-01. It is considered that this is an anomaly as it does not correspond with legal boundaries on the ground, granted planning permissions in place and the established use on the ground at this site. The open space zoning encroaches onto the industrially developed lands. It is therefore requested that the Industry zoning, LI-I-01, be extended, so as to correctly reflect the development in place on the ground, as implemented in accordance with planning permission reference 12/6549, which granted planning permission in 2013 for a General Purpose Transport Yard and Tank Washing Facility.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Anomaly where small area of land is excluded from LI-I-01 and included within LI-GC-01.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a mapping error whereby a very small strip of developed land adjoining the boundary of LI-I-01 was inadvertently included within the LI-GC-01. See Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.5, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, of this report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend LI-I-01 and LI-GC-01 so that a small developed strip of land is excluded from LI-GC-01 and included in LI-I-01.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Niall and Maura Murphy</b>



<b>DCDP345045653</b>	DCDP345045653
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Commends the approach in the Draft Plan to the future development of Glounthaune.</p> <p>Submits that the provision for residential development on the low lying lands adjacent the old N25, with easy access to the sustainable modes of transport of rail and bus routes, following the recent development of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, is sensible.</p> <p>States that the Draft Plan takes into consideration the topography and inadequate road infrastructure to the north of the settlement, which makes it unsuitable for further residential development.</p> <p>States that the identification of the “dry bridge” as a distinctive element of the village’s built heritage is appreciated. Welcomes the rezoning of the lands adjacent to the school for community facilities (GN-C-01) considering the proposed increase in population in the area.</p> <p>Is in favour of limiting development to the west and east to maintain the strategic gap between Glounthaune and the settlements of Glanmire and Carrigtwohill.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports objective of developing residential units close to sustainable transport.</li> <li>2. Does not support residential development on the higher grounds to north due to topography and inadequate road infrastructure.</li> <li>3. Architectural significance of the Lacken Roe (Dry Bridge) &amp; preservation of same is of key importance to the local community.</li> <li>4. Favours maintaining strategic gap between Glounthaune and the settlements of Glanmire and Carrigtwohill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted. An area of elevated land has been excluded from the development boundary as it is considered that there is ample land to meet the growth target identified for the village on more suitable land, closer to the village centre and the rail.</li> <li>3. Noted. This is included in the RPS.</li> <li>4. The strategic gap between Glounthaune and the settlements of Glanmire and Carrigtwohill is to be maintained. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Connell Group</b>
<b>DCDP346124377</b>	DCDP346124377
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to two sites east of the M8, that adjoin existing employment uses at the Brooklodge East location, Glanmire. Their owner operates an existing warehousing facility on adjacent lands. The northernmost site was zoned GM-I-01 in the 2017 LAP, part of the other site was identified as existing built up area in the LAP and part of it was Metropolitan Greenbelt in the LAP. The two sites and the adjoining existing uses are within the Metropolitan Greenbelt in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Submission points to plans for the development of the Munster Football Centre</p>

	<p>of Excellence in the area and describes the area as having the characteristics of a small settlement, including residential, employment, amenities and public transport links. Indicates that the Brooklodge census Small Area supports a population of 300. Considers that Brooklodge East should at least be included in the settlement hierarchy as an Other Location. Views Brooklodge East being subject to green belt policies as an oversight.</p> <p>States that the principle of expansion of warehousing in this area has previously been supported by Cork County Council and is consistent with principles for employment growth outlined in National and Regional Policy. Outlines planning history and sets out planning policy context, particularly in relation to employment, including extracts from NPF policy, from Future Jobs Ireland 2019, from the Southern RSES and the MASP, from the 2014 CDP, from the 2017 Cobh MD LAP, and from the Draft Plan. It notes objective CCS 2-7 of the Draft Plan in relation to Other Locations.</p> <p>Outlines the suitability of the area for expansion and considers that the expansion of warehousing activities in this area is consistent with many of the principles of employment growth as outlined in the RSES. Indicates that the area has strong road connectivity to surrounding areas and is accessible by sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>Points to the need for a policy framework for Brooklodge East to provide for its orderly and sustainable development. Submits that there is a need for additional logistics development in Cork.</p> <p>A review of existing conditions for civil infrastructural services as well as an assessment of the impacts and design considerations associated with any proposed development of the lands forms part of the submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate/necessary to exclude subject land from the Metropolitan Greenbelt?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is an objective of the County Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt to prevent coalescence of built up areas and to focus attention on lands within settlements which are zoned for development. Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to exclude the subject lands from the greenbelt.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Leary O'Sullivan Developments</b>
<b>DCDP346047096</b>	DCDP346047096
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to the village of Knockraha and the level of new housing development set out in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The submission provides a very detailed planning history for the Village. It is noted that a new pump station is currently under construction. They developed a wastewater treatment plant at Glenmore Heights in 2019 with a capacity of 175pe. In addition, the watermain network was upgraded by Irish Water in</p>

	<p>2019.</p> <p>Reference is made to planning policy and objectives of the National Planning Framework, the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, Action Plan for Rural Development (2017), Rebuilding Ireland, the County Development Plan 2014 (CDP) and the Cobh Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (Cobh LAP).</p> <p>The provisions of the Draft Plan as they relate to Knockraha are noted including the serious deficiency in both wastewater and water infrastructure and that new development is limited to a maximum of 10 units and can only proceed on the basis of individual houses with their own wastewater treatment facilities because of cumulative environmental effects.</p> <p>They note all the planned and permitted new developments could be argued to conflict with the Draft Plan policy objective for 10no. units in the village over the plan period 2022-2028.</p> <p>They note that conversely, there is no such upper limit placed upon one off houses in the open countryside with CSO figures suggesting that approximately 70% of all houses in rural areas in County Cork are one offs in the open countryside.</p> <p>They consider that the development of housing in Knockraha has contributed significantly to a reduction in development pressure for one off dwellings and note it has also demonstrated that there is a strong market demand for houses within the village. They accept that any development occurring within urban areas should be premised on the availability of infrastructure and services and be of a scale, layout and design that respects the character of the settlement but that these matters are more appropriately addressed through development management.</p> <p>Further they note that the policy of setting maximum limits has been repeatedly overruled in development management decisions made by both the Council and An Board Pleanála over the lifetime of the current plans and they include a detailed Table which gives examples of where overall scale of development has been exceeded by individual planning permissions.</p> <p>They seek that the proposed scale of development figure for Knockraha is reviewed and either modified or removed to better reflect the potential for development within the settlement and the possibility for infrastructure solutions to facilitate further development over the period 2022-2028.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	What is the most appropriate growth target for Knockraha for the Plan period?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The growth target for the Plan period, of 10 units, has been identified with regard to the deficiency in both wastewater and water supply infrastructure in the village. Upgrading of same is the responsibility of Irish Water. Upgrades to either service do not feature on their investment plan. In the absence of such plans the Planning Authority considers that a relatively low growth target for the village of 10 units is the most responsible approach to take. See key issue, Volume 1, Chapter 11 Water Management, of this report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Oliver Sheehan</b>

<b>DCDP342213668</b>	DCDP342213668
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Details submitter's background of community involvement. Outlines concerns in relation to proposed high density residential development in Carrigtwohill. Outlines the need for a balanced housing mix, not dominated by multi storey apartment blocks, to achieve a sense of ownership and belonging within the community. Submitter feels that his potential clients may choose lower density areas further East/North thereby increasing car ownership. Questions feasibility/affordability of apartments. Makes reference to completion of lower density elements of unfinished Castlelake development. Fears risk of creating ghetto if percentage of social housing is increased. References Cambourne in UK as a thriving community with medium to high densities. Asks if the Council has proactively looked at infill of existing sites in Carrigtwohill.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the draft plan allow for sufficient diversity of housing types in Carrigtwohill and is it appropriate to zoned land for high density residential development in Carrigtwohill?</li> <li>2. Infill of existing sites in Carrigtwohill.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan seeks to deliver a more compact growth form and to integrate land use and transport planning 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 relative low densities. See Key Issue, Density, Chapter 3, Volume 1 of this report.</li> <li>2. The Plan recognises the potential for infill development in the town such as on the CT-R-01 site and within town centre sites. Five infill sites have been specifically identified as regeneration areas and a range of suitable uses is proposed for these sites, including residential use.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Mahony Developments</b>
<b>DCDP346035833</b>	DCDP346035833
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The site is located in the northern environs of Cobh and is bounded by existing residential lands to the south and to the northeast. The last remaining section of zoned land in College Manor (to the south) is currently being developed and if these lands were zoned, residential they would be in a position to commence construction immediately.</p> <p>The submission sets out the planning policy context and includes reference to the National Planning Framework, Project Ireland 2040, Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region, Cork County Development Plan 2014, and the Draft County Development Plan 2022 – 2028.</p> <p>They consider that if Cobh is to deliver on its strategic aim as a Metropolitan</p>

	<p>town, the strategic planning policy context must support flexible development during the lifetime of the forthcoming Development plan, on lands such as this land holding at Cobh and it is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council modifies the settlement boundary for the Main Town of Cobh to include this land within the development boundary; and</li> <li>• Zone them as residential by extending the CH-R-11 zoning.</li> </ul> <p>They are of the view that there is an acute shortage of serviced residential land and housing output in the Cork Metropolitan area, which is having a detrimental impact on the Council's growth targets. They consider that the need to deliver housing within Metropolitan Cork and especially Cobh, is urgent. They submit that this land is suitable for development in the short-term.</p> <p>Further regarding paragraph 4.42 of the Development Plan Guidance they consider they meet the following criteria: 1. Need, 2. Policy Context, 3. Capacity of Water, 4. Drainage and Roads Infrastructure, 5. Supporting Infrastructure and Facilities, 6. Physical Suitability, 7. Sequential Approach, and 8. Environmental and Heritage Policy. In terms of roads, water supply and drainage infrastructure, the site can connect to the College Manor development to the south, which is currently being developed and is nearing completion. There are no environmental or heritage considerations which affect the site. Existing flood overlay maps available from Lee CFrams and the 2017 Local Area Development Plans demonstrate that there are no flood issues which affect the proposed site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is an expansion of the development boundary of Cobh and additional residential land required to deliver the growth target for the settlement?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is ample land zoned for residential development within the development boundary of Cobh to deliver the target identified in the plan. In response to the OPR submission to the draft plan it is proposed that some of this land will be identified for use beyond the plan period. See proposed amendments Volume 2, Parts 1 and 2 (Core Strategy and Cobh MD). The existing zonings are considered to be appropriate. Additional land is not required.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Orla Long</b>
<b>DCDP345894569</b>	DCDP345894569
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission commends plans for Glounthaune (provision for school expansion, road improvements, amenities etc).</p> <p>It is requested that more housing be provided on flat land near the train station, bus stop, church and post office as the steep hills makes a commute to the train station difficult.</p> <p>It is considered that Dry Bridge is an important heritage element in the area and should be protected.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Supports objective of developing residential units close to sustainable transport.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Requests that residential development be on land near public transport and other services and not on the higher grounds to north due to topography and inadequate road infrastructure.</li> <li>3. Architectural significance of the Lacken Roe (Dry Bridge) &amp; preservation of same is of key importance to the local community.</li> </ol> <p>Favours maintaining strategic gap between Glounthaune and the settlements of Glanmire and Carrigtwohill.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted. An area of elevated land has been excluded from the development boundary as it is considered that there is ample land to meet the growth target identified for the village on more suitable land, closer to the village centre and the rail. Land identified as GN-R-04, north of the village core, is now under construction. Other land zoned for residential development is located close to the rail station.</li> <li>3. Noted. This is included in the RPS.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pádraig O Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345803956</b>	DCDP345803956
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that Cork County Council consider the submission of the Carrignavar Community Council in relation to the upgrade and provision of adequate water and wastewater facilities to service the village of Carrignavar appropriately.</p> <p>Describes the draft plan proposal of 10 units within the development boundary as a paltry amount considering Carrignavar is 12 minutes to Cork City and submits that the proximity of the village to Cork, and the existing amenities and services in the village, should lead to County Council being far more ambitious subject to the necessary upgrading of WWTPs.</p> <p>Asks that account be taken of what the local community has sought and not restrict the natural growth capacity of the village and indeed the new school.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrade and provision of adequate water services.</li> <li>2. What is the most appropriate growth target for Carrignavar for the Plan period?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrade and provision of adequate water services is the responsibility of Irish Water and is outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>2. The growth target for the Plan period, of 10 units, has been identified with regard to the deficiency in both wastewater and water supply infrastructure in the village. Upgrading of same is the responsibility of Irish Water. Upgrades to either service do not feature on their investment plan. In the absence of such plans the Planning Authority considers that a relatively low growth target for the village of 10 units is the most responsible approach to take.</li> </ol> <p>See key issue, Chapter 11 Water Management, Volume 1 of this report.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pádraig O Sullivan TD</b>
<b>DCDP345795203</b>	DCDP345795203
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission supports the submissions of the Knockraha Community Association and Mr. James O Donoghue in identifying lands for suitable residential and amenity space in Knockraha.</p> <p>The 2 designated amenity spaces in the Knockraha development boundary, C-03 and C-01 are not available to the community and will not be in to the future. In that respect the reconsideration of the amenity designation for Knockraha is urged and it is requested to amend the plan to include Mr. O Donoghue's request to zone his land for residential and amenity to the west of the village as it will give the community what it needs, a vibrant social outlet to compliment the excellent work that they do locally.</p> <p>From a residential perspective Mr. O Donoghue's request would form a natural extension to the Glenmore Heights estate. While the village water and waste water issues are well known and in time, and with the relevant upgrade of facilities that this area would be suitable for further development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provision of active open space in Knockraha.</li> <li>2. Is it necessary to amend the development boundary of Knockraha to include additional land for residential development?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A site zoned GA-01, proximate to the school and existing residential development is considered to be the most suitable site for the provision of active open space. C-01 has been zoned for an extension of the existing school and as such is best located beside the school. C-02 has been zoned for an extension/upgrade of the existing community building and as such is best located beside the community building. Issues of site availability can change and as such it is the locational, topographical etc. suitability of the site for the land use proposed that has determined the zoning of the sites.</li> <li>2. Due to the deficiency of water services in Knockraha a growth level of 10 residential units has been identified for the Plan period. There is ample land within the development boundary to accommodate this and it is not considered necessary to amend it. See Volume 1, Key Issue, Water Management.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pádraig O Sullivan TD</b>
<b>DCDP346282908</b>	DCDP346282908
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission welcomes Little Island residential reserve zoning LI-RR-01 but seeks clarity on how the Council intends to allow development to proceed there. Believes that, once LI-X-01 is developed, development of LI-RR-01 needs to be allowed to proceed expeditiously and seeks wording to explicitly reflect this.</p>



	<p>Seeks a residential land reserve zoning for LI-I-02 which is zoned for commercial/ industrial use.</p> <p>Makes reference to a once in a life time opportunity to allow Little island become a thriving residential area in to the future and to allow employees live and work in the same area.</p> <p>Outlines a specific area where it proposes a walk/cycleway to join up in time with the existing walkway at Carrigrennan.</p> <p>Outlines an area within LI-GA-07 for which it seeks that provision would be made to allow the one resident in that area, whose primary business in located nearby, to build a one off house on his own land to meet his needs.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification in relation to residential reserve lands.</li> <li>2. What is the most appropriate zoning for LI-I-02 – is additional residential land required?</li> <li>3. Additional walkway at Little Island.</li> <li>4. Is the proposed portion of LI-GA-07 suitable for the development of a house?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As outlined in the Plan, in some of the Metropolitan Towns lands have been identified for residential development which are not required in the short to medium term but are located in settlements where accelerated growth is anticipated in the future. These lands have been classified as a Residential Reserve to support their future availability for residential use and to ensure the long term strategic vision for the sustainable development of these lands, and the delivery of enabling infrastructure, can be realised. It is important that these lands continue to be identified as part of the longer term residential land supply to bring some certainty to the development process. It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to this. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 18 and Chapter 2.</li> <li>2. It is considered that there is sufficient land within the LI-X-01 zoning, and within the existing built up area, to accommodate the growth target identified for the Plan period and as such it is not considered necessary to amend LI-I-02.</li> <li>3. There is an existing walkway where the submission proposed a walkway and it is considered appropriate to identify this in the Plan with an objective to retain it. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.14 Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Little Island text and zoning map to include new specific objective for retention of amenity walk.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pádraig O Sullivan TD</b>
<b>DCDP346289872</b>	DCDP346289872
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that the zoning objectives in relation to CT-I-01 be reconsidered given the close proximity of Glounthaune to Carrigtwohill in terms of existing and projected development.</p> <p>Submits that if this zoning designation was to proceed it would further erode</p>

	<p>the greenbelt between the two development boundaries of Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill.</p> <p>Submits that in the interests of proper and sustainable planning that further encroachment of Carrigtwohill in to the rural hinterland of Glounthaune should be resisted.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pádraig O'Riordan</b>
<b>DCDP345987373</b>	DCDP345987373
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to the zoning of land at Meenane, Watergrasshill (part of folio 57475F), to the south of and adjoining WT-B-02 to Business and General Employment Uses.</p> <p>Considers Watergrasshill to be an ideal location by merit of its proximity to Cork City and the M8 Motorway. Further the zoning of this site would allow the natural expansion of the established Watergrasshill Business Centre and Kart World, which they note is nearly at 100% occupancy. Finally, because of this new infrastructure would not be required.</p> <p>Considers the creation of employment opportunities near where the existing and future predicted population growth of Watergrasshill and the surrounding area live would result in sustainable development. Local school leavers would not have to commute for employment opportunities which would also benefit the environment.</p> <p>Notes that there are a variety of business uses for this land that would strengthen the business infrastructure and employment base of Watergrasshill and the surrounding area including: Transport, Logistics, Distribution, Wholesale, Storage, and Commercial.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a requirement for additional employment land in Watergrasshill and is this location preferable to zoned land within the development boundary?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are sufficient lands zoned for employment uses in Watergrasshill and nearby settlements. There is significant capacity within the WT-B-02 zoning. The existing employment zonings are considered to be more appropriate than this greenfield site adjoining WT-B-02. It is not proposed to zone additional greenfield land for employment use in Watergrasshill at this stage. It is intended that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan the Planning Authority will complete an business land availability study which will inform the need for any future changes to employment land provision.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pat Cotter &amp; Brenda Kelleher</b>

<b>DCDP344424390</b>	DCDP344424390
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to land that comprises part of CT-GC-08, part of CT-RR-02 and part of CT-R-16 in the Draft Plan and requests that the land be zoned for residential development. It states that the land was previously zoned Open Space/Recreational based on inaccurate flood reports and that a flood report (accompanying this submission) submitted with a previous planning application (on part of the overall site) concluded that the area, at worst, would be in the lowest, Zone C, flood risk category. It submits that there is sufficient open space along the rail line and that this additional open space is not required. It refers to present and future housing need of the landowners/extended family, references longstanding working of the land by the family over generations and submits that the family should at least have the possibility of continuing to work the land or live on the land.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Appropriate use of site zoned CT-GC-08.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Updated flood risk mapping identifies a reduced area of flood risk on this land. However, 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 in Chapter 11. The land is to form part of the Linear Park East open space to serve adjoining Urban Expansion Area lands. It is considered appropriate to retain this zoning to provide sufficient recreation and amenity lands to serve the future population of Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Peter Kidney</b>
<b>DCDP344950069</b>	DCDP344950069
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests that the 21 Ditches, Ballybrassil be upgraded to a greenway accessible to the public due to its use over hundreds of years. States that part of the walk is already owned by Coillte (Marlogue Wood). Fears that if no action is taken the walkway will be lost due to coastal erosion. States that planning applications in the past recognised the right of way. Includes correspondence to the Planning Department made in 1976 which makes reference to a right of way.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Identification of rights of way.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Rights of way – see Key issue, Green Infrastructure, Volume 1, Part 1.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Philip Roche</b>
<b>DCDP345264639</b>	DCDP345264639
<b>Submission Summary</b>	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.  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

	<p>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 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, regarding flood risk 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>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the draft plan allow for sufficient diversity of housing types in Carrigtwohill?</li> <li>2. Is the density proposed for the CT-R-18 site, and the scale of the site, appropriate?</li> <li>3. Is the CT-U-10 zoning appropriate?</li> <li>4. Is an increase in sustainable transport use achievable in Carrigtwohill and the CT-R-18?</li> <li>5. Habitat loss due to development of site.</li> <li>6. How are features of the built heritage, such as stone walls of Bog Rd. protected?</li> <li>7. Is the proposed zoning appropriate from a flood risk perspective?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ol>

	<p>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, Volume 1 of this report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. The Plan seeks to balance development with protection of biodiversity. Chapter 15 of the Plan, Biodiversity and Environment contains objectives for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, including objective BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development to ensure the protection of biodiversity in the development management process. In addition it is proposed to amend the Plan to achieve a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity through objectives in Chapter 15. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1.15.8, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment.</li> <li>6. 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.</li> <li>7. 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.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Chapter 15 to provide for the achievement of a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Prestige Homes Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346063077</b>	DCDP346063077
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission relates to Watergrasshill and requests an extension of the settlement boundary and an increase in the amount of residential zoned land, particularly 7 acres of land adjacent to the south western settlement boundary. Referencing National, Regional and Local policy as set out in the National Planning Framework (NPF), Regional Spatial Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), Cork County Development Plan 2014 (CDP) and draft Plan, they note the aim to concentrate growth and development in key growth areas that have the infrastructural capacity to take development in a sustainable manner. They consider that the current approach to drawing development boundaries is conservative and relies on the historic mapping lacking any coherent rationale. They consider that the focus should be on the accessibility of sites to services and availability of infrastructure when considering sites for zoning. They consider there should be increased flexibility in land use zoning and put forward the use of a zoning matrix.</p> <p>Notes there are three zoned residential sites of which two are under construction or completed which leaves just one residential zoned site remaining and is not available for purchase.</p> <p>They note the following in support of their submission:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have a track record delivering high quality homes in Watergrasshill.</li> <li>• Reference a previous agreement with Cork County Council during the 2017 LAP review process that the remaining 7 acres would be zoned once the first 7 acres had been developed.</li> <li>• They have made substantial investment in infrastructure in the village (Wastewater Services Infrastructure project with Irish Water, new road layout, streetlights, pedestrian crossing, and traffic calming measures)</li> <li>• As a result, there is spare capacity of in excess of 1500 population person equivalent in the WWTP.</li> <li>• There is capacity in the National School, in the water supply, the site is accessible on foot to local amenities, serviced by public transport, adjacent to the motorway, has a range of sports clubs and leisure facilities in the area, 2 shops, a pharmacy, and a restaurant in the village.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for additional zoned land in Watergrasshill for residential development to meet the growth target for the settlement?</li> <li>2. Is this site appropriate for any additional residential development required?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A revision of the Core Strategy of the Plan has identified a requirement for an additional 59 residential units to be delivered during the lifetime of the plan. Additional zoning is required in Watergrasshill.</li> <li>2. This site adjoins an existing residential development that is currently being developed by the submitter. It is considered appropriate to include a portion of this site within the development boundary and to zone it for Medium A density residential development with access to be provided through the existing adjoining estate to the east. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.9.3 Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD and see also amend to Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1.2.14.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the development boundary of Watergrasshill to include an additional zoning, WT-R-04, of 2 hectares.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Prestige Homes Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346300531</b>	DCDP346300531
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submits that Watergrasshill lacks a nursing home and the submitter would like to develop one close to Watergrasshill. Requests that a nursing home be included as an acceptable use within the WT- B-01 zoning in Watergrasshill. Additional points include:</p> <p>Developer's record of delivery of homes in the village; developer's investment in infrastructure in the village; spare water services capacity; lands within walking distance of school and all local amenities; availability of public transport from lands; lands adjacent to M8 and accessible to Cork City; numerous services and facilities in the area; developer currently building on adjacent site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is a nursing home an acceptable use within WT-B-01?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A nursing home is not an acceptable use within a business zoning. The WT-B-01 zoning of the site is considered to be appropriate and it is noted that the submitter does not raise any issue with the business zoning per se. A nursing home is an acceptable use within a residential zoning and could be considered on WT-X-01, WT-R-02 or on land to the north west of the village within the

	development boundary, all of which benefit from better pedestrian connectivity to the village centre.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Professor Patrick O'Flanagan</b>
<b>DCDP344239552</b>	DCDP344239552
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that St. Colman's Square be added to the list of Architectural Conservation areas in Cobh town. It also raises a concern that, in the event of a disaster requiring evacuation from Cobh, a second, secure exit from Great Island needs to be planned by the Council, in addition to upgrading the R624 and Belvelly Bridge, stating that tidal, wind and rainfall conditions could combine to make an upgraded R624 impassable, as occurred in the recent past.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Proposal to designate St. Colman's Square as an Architectural Conservation Area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It has not been determined by the Heritage section of the Council that St. Colman's Square meets the criteria for designation as an Architectural Conservation Area. Note the objectives of Chapter 16 to protect built and cultural heritage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Progressive Commercial Construction Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346148292</b>	DCDP346148292
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to a 8.16 hectare site at Wallingstown, Little Island, at the former Corden Pharmachem site, the northern section of which is zoned Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses in the Draft Plan and the southern section of which is zoned Green Infrastructure. Seeks an amendment to the zoning of the southern section of the site from 'Green Infrastructure' to 'Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses'.</p> <p>Submission describes that the site is close to other employment uses and benefits from existing and proposed connectivity. Submits that site was recently acquired by one of the most active industrial property developers in the Cork region and that there is currently a significant shortage of high quality industrial space in Cork which is now starting to materially impact on the Cork area's short to medium term growth prospects and ability to attract new investment.</p> <p>Submits that site owner has begun the pre planning process for a high quality sustainable industrial type development, fundamental to the delivery of which is the (submitter's) proposed zoning objective for the southern part of the site.</p> <p>Outlines planning policy context including reference to NPF population growth, RSES for Southern Region, 2014 CDP, 2017 Cobh MD LAP, and the Draft Plan, in particular highlighting reference to identification of Little Island as a Strategic Employment Location.</p>



	<p>Outlines planning history of site, including what it describes as the key application applicable to the subject site, a 2009 application relating to the northern portion of the site.</p> <p>States that, notwithstanding the fact that the woodland area – which it submits is not a native woodland - to the south of the site has been established for some time, the entire site was previously zoned ‘Existing Industrial’ in the 2005 LAP, and ‘Existing Built Up Area’ in the 2011 LAP, as varied in 2015, and in the 2017 LAP. Submits that the extent of the Green Infrastructure zoning proposed extends beyond the non-native woodland area, and significantly affects the development potential of the entire site.</p> <p>An ecological baseline overview forms part of the submission and finds that, based on the preliminary surveys completed on the site and a review of historical mapping, the southern section of the site, dominated by woodland and scrub habitat, is of local ecological importance (higher value). Finds that the treelines forming the eastern boundary to the site are of local importance (higher value), while the landscaped planting and areas of built land are of Local importance (lower value). Submits that the extent of the area identified as Green Infrastructure goes beyond the non-native woodland to includes parts of the previous built footprint.</p> <p>Submits that the applicant, with the guidance of the project ecologist, is committed to establishing and implementing a proper management plan for the site including preparation of a Landscape Masterplan and Biodiversity Enhancement Plan to ensure no net loss of woodland habitat and retention of green infrastructure corridors.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is part of the LI-GC-06 zoning suitable for incorporation into the Existing mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses zone adjoining it?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Further review of the site and consideration of the ecological report reinforce the view that the green infrastructure zoning would be retained on the area of mature broad-leaved woodland within LI-GC-06. It would be reasonable to facilitate the re-incorporation of areas in the north and east of the zone where scrub has developed due to lack of active management over the past years into the Existing mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses zone. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.3, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, of this report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend LI-GC-06 to exclude the area of scrub and incorporate it into the adjoining Existing mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses zone, and to retain the area of woodland.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Progressive Commercial Construction Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346127203</b>	DCDP346127203
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission relates to the southern section (c27 Hectares) of the former Mitsui Denman brownfield site at Wallingstown, Little Island, zoned LI-I-05 in the Draft Plan. It seeks an amendment to the zoning for the subject site from the proposed LI-I-05 objective to an expanded LI-X-02 objective for the entire former Mitsui Denman site to facilitate the provision of business and/or industry and/or office and/or data centre development and/or transport, warehousing and logistics to be guided by an overall masterplan, to be subject

	<p>to screening for SEA and HDA as appropriate.</p> <p>Describes location of the site including proximity and connectivity to Dunkettle (making reference to roundabout under construction which forms part of the direct link between the R623 and the Dunkettle Interchange). States that site is mostly flat and is bound to the south by an amenity walk. Submits that the site has been remediated and restored under licence following the closure of the previous industrial use, including the decommissioning of the wastewater lagoons.</p> <p>Outlines policy context including reference to NPF and employment growth target for region, the RSES for the Southern Region and its identification of Little Island as a Strategic Employment Location, the 2014 CDP, the 2017 Cobh MD LAP and the Draft Plan (including objectives LI-I-05 and ZU 18-16).</p> <p>Submits that there is market evidence of significant demand coupled with a lack of supply for industrial units, highlighted by conclusions from a number of reports from property advisers active in the Cork region. States that there is a continued need for office uses in strategic locations, as well as data centre development.</p> <p>Submits that the entire former Mitsui Denman site (c40 hectares) is brownfield, remediated, restored; strategically located; has existing and proposed infrastructure, including utilities and sustainable transportation infrastructure; has permission for data centre, is suitable for office type use, has a positive policy environment, and a waterfront setting.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is a more general employment zoning appropriate for LI-I-05?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The site is zoned for industry in the Plan. It is considered that, even with a significant modal shift away from use of the private car, a more general employment zoning, or an expanded LI-X-02, to also accommodate business use would have a higher impact on traffic in the area than an industrial use and would risk undermining the Dunkettle upgrade project currently underway. Accordingly the industrial zoning is on LI-I-05 is more suitable than a broader employment zoning.</p> <p>As habitats within the site have been significantly altered the objective may be amended to remove the reference to habitats of county importance. The protection of remnant habitats of ecological value within the site is covered by LI-GO-04 and by policy outlined in Chapter 15 Biodiversity. See proposed amendment to the text of LI-I-05 in relation to habitat, PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.21, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment to broaden the range of employment uses within the LI-I-05 proposed. Amend however the text of objective LI-I-05 to remove the reference to habitats of county importance while retaining reference to SPA.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Prompto Despatch Limited</b>
<b>DCDP345160936</b>	DCDP345160936
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to a 2.4Ha greenfield site north of, and across the L-1540-0 road from, Watergrasshill Commerical park, c1km east of Watergrasshill village. Requests that the subject lands are included within the development boundary of Watergrasshill and within the WT-B-02 zoning.</p> <p>The interested party, Prompto Despatch, are located at the Watergrasshill</p>

	<p>Commerical Park from which they currently provide a storage, warehousing and delivery service - the company having evolved and expanded in Cork since 1986. The company's current facilities are no longer adequate. Further expansion is required to successfully grow the business.</p> <p>Sets out planning policy from the 2014 CDP: aim of key villages, objective EE 9-1 Business Development in Rural Areas, Objective EE 4-4 Industry, Objective RCI 5-8 Greenbelts Around Settlements. Also sets out the 2017 LAP objective and the Draft CDP objective for the commercial park and adjoining zoned lands to its south. It sets out the strategic aim and overall employment strategy for key villages contained in the Draft CDP.</p> <p>Rationale for request includes land being serviced and available; support for flexible development required to realise key village aim; metropolitan greenbelt status of land inhibiting expansion of the business. Submits that undeveloped land within the WT-B-02 zoning is unavailable and unsuitable. Submits that the site has good access to the national road network and is not proximate to environmental/natural interest/scenic routes/landscape areas.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a requirement for additional employment land in Watergrasshill and is this location preferable to zoned land within the development boundary?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are sufficient lands zoned for employment uses in Watergrasshill and nearby settlements. There is significant capacity within the WT-B-02 zoning. The existing employment zonings are considered to be more appropriate than this greenfield site adjoining WT-B-02. It is not proposed to zone additional greenfield land for employment use. It is intended that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan the Planning Authority will complete a business land availability study which will inform the need for any future changes to employment land provision.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ray Mills</b>
<b>DCDP345223444</b>	DCDP345223444
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to lands in the Metropolitan Greenbelt at Marino Cobh, across the R624 from Marino Point, adjoining Cobh Golf Club, for which it seeks zoning as an opportunity site to facilitate a petrol station and forecourt and car dealership.</p> <p>Proposal is to facilitate consolidation and relocation of existing business currently at 4 separate locations in Cobh Town stating that the Town Council previously agreed that the nature and scale of the business would be better located outside the built up area. States that site is shielded from views from across the harbour. States that proposed use of site is complementary to adjacent industrial use and could aid establishment of economic activity in the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the proposed greenbelt site an appropriate location for the proposed employment use?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Metropolitan Greenbelt is not considered to be an appropriate location for the development of a new petrol station and car dealership (see Greenbelt objectives in Draft Plan). It is considered that there is already sufficient land zoned within the development boundary of Cobh for such a use. It is intended that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan the Planning Authority will

	complete a business land availability study which will inform the need for any future changes to employment land provision.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Richard Cuddy</b>
<b>DCDP346057811</b>	DCDP346057811
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>It is considered that the extension of the western boundary of Carrigtwohill towards Glounthaune would result in linear sprawl essentially merging both settlements, there is sufficient land zoned for industry and that CT-I-01 should be removed from the Carrigtwohill Settlement Boundary and zoned as green belt.</p> <p>In relation to Glounthaune, notes that the scale of growth over the last decade has not been matched by an increase in facilities and services and this needs to be addressed. They suggest that the land zoned as CT-I-01 would be better zoned as amenity/community space to be shared between both settlements. They note there will be a cycle path running adjacent which would be accessible for pedestrians and sustainable transport methods.</p> <p>Further they suggest the following enhancements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Linear walkway for scrubland opposite Rockgrove next to the train tracks to provide pedestrian/cycle access from the station to the road.</li> <li>2. Car parking area within 200 m of Harper's Island to facilitate visitors to the island and to restrict parking on the road/cycle path.</li> <li>3. Traffic calming measures on the roads approaching R623.</li> <li>4. Safety of pedestrians /cyclists through the dry bridge area.</li> <li>5. Pedestrian link to Erin's Own.</li> </ol> <p>Regarding GN-R-01 at Ashbourne the zoning objective should be changed to read "Medium A density residential and mixed use development to contribute to a 10 minute town concept and improve liveability and quality of place in the settlement." They submit that due to the woodland setting and habitat, any development should protect site character and biodiversity value as much as possible particularly through retention of trees and preserving the integrity of the heritage gardens.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> <li>2. Would a community zoning be more a appropriate use of CT-I-01?</li> <li>3. Car park provision to serve Harper's Island Westlands.</li> <li>4. Pedestrian access to rail station.</li> <li>5. Traffic calming and pedestrian/cyclist safety.</li> <li>6. Pedestrian link to Erin's Own.</li> <li>7. Promotion of 10 minute town.</li> <li>8. Ashbourne House and biodiversity.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>2. A community/amenity space, they extent of CT-I-01 is not considered necessary. There are lands zoned in both Carraigtwohill and Glounthaune for the provision of community facilities and amenity/recreation.</li> <li>3. It is not proposed to provide for the provision of parking close to Harper's Island Wetlands in the Plan.</li> <li>4. There is good pedestrian/cycle connectivity to the rail station.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The plan highlights the poor road network in Glounthaune and seeks to achieve enhanced pedestrian and connectivity, in particular through implementation of the objectives of Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility. Traffic calming however is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>6. It is not currently proposed to provide a pedestrian link between Glounthaune and Erin's Own.</li> <li>7. The development of GN-R-01, proximate to the rail and the village centre, aligns with the 10 minute town concept. See also objectives of Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility and Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking that will deliver 10 minute towns.</li> <li>8. It is proposed to reduce the approximate net developable area of the GN-R-01 zoning to reflect the significance of the wooded gardens around Ashbourne House following consideration of additional information in relation to Ashbourne House gardens. It is also proposed to strengthen the requirement for protection of the trees in the objective of the site. Given the need to protect the trees and the corresponding appropriate net housing area the site has limited potential for a mix of uses. It is considered however that the site has the potential to provide a small scale community or recreation use which would connect with the new cycleway and which may be accommodated more sensitively than a larger residential footprint. This will assist in delivering the 10 minute town concept. See proposed amendments, NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill. Amend GN-R-01 to strengthen protection of the trees and to provide for small scale community or recreation use. See also related proposed amendment to increase the area of GN-R-01 to afford an integrated approach to the protection of the trees.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ronan McManamy</b>
<b>DCDP345446506</b>	DCDP345446506
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to CT-R-18 &amp; 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. 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 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</p>

	<p>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>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the draft plan allow for sufficient diversity of housing types in Carrigtwohill?</li> <li>2. Is the density proposed for the CT-R-18 site, and the scale of the site, appropriate?</li> <li>3. Is the CT-U-10 zoning appropriate?</li> <li>4. Is an increase in sustainable transport use achievable in Carrigtwohill and the CT-R-18?</li> <li>5. How are features of the built heritage, such as stone walls of Bog Rd. protected?</li> <li>6. Habitat loss.</li> <li>7. Is the proposed zoning appropriate from a flood risk perspective?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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, Volume one of this report.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>



	<p>6. The Plan seeks to balance development with protection of biodiversity. Chapter 15 of the Plan, Biodiversity and Environment contains objectives for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, including objective BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development to ensure the protection of biodiversity in the development management process. In addition it is proposed to amend the Plan to achieve a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity through objectives in Chapter 15. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1.15.8, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment.</p> <p>7. 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.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend Chapter 15 Biodiversity to achieve a net gain and enhancement of biodiversity.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ruairi &amp; Jude O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP340083779</b>	DCDP340083779
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission references CT-R-10 residential zoning in Carrigtwohill and states that the proposed bypass road crosses through the submitters' property and is unacceptable.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of new road.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The submission would seem to relate to the CT-U-02 provision of new East West Spine link road to access development lands in the Carrigtwohill Urban Expansion Area. This is considered necessary to facilitate the UEA development. As outlined in the Draft Plan, paragraph 1.4.2, all roads, walks and cycleways routes shown on maps are Indicative.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ruden Homes Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP343800971</b>	DCDP343800971
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to Glounthaune and requests that the site identified in Draft CDP as GN-C-01 be retained predominantly for residential use with provision in the south east corner (C-01 in the LAP) for community use.</p> <p>Sets out site locational context (elevated greenfield site primarily enclosed by dwellings and adjoining school), vision for the village in the 2017 LAP, and sets out village context in terms of services and location.</p> <p>Sets out planning policy context with reference to Glounthaune vision from 2017 LAP, 2014 CDP, and CMATS. References importance of Metropolitan Cork in the development of the Cork Gateway as an integrated planning unit.</p> <p>Emphasises Glounthaune's rail transport offering and references some of the supporting infrastructure required for enhanced Cork Suburban Rail Services (improvements at Glounthaune Junction, and double track between Glounthaune and Midleton), makes references to CMATS anticipation of more modest housing growth at Glounthaune, and makes reference to CMATS statement that consolidation will further support the viability of the rail</p>



	<p>corridor. Sets out key NPF NSOs of relevance to Glounthaune as well as RSES RPO 10 and other references of relevance to the concept of integrated land use and transport planning, and compact and sequential growth.</p> <p>It sets out a rationale for the submission request including site location and particularly the location of Glounthaune on a rail corridor - citing CMATS policies. States that site is close to employment centres, is within walking distance of local services including school (which site adjoins), GAA facilities and train station, that it will provide enhanced pedestrian connectivity to the rail station and the village, (including provision of safer connectivity to the school from existing residential developments) and that site is fully serviceable. States that development of the site would support consolidated growth. States that development of the site is deliverable and viable and makes reference to SHD being actively progressed for site. Outlines consideration that zoning the entire site for community facilities is unwarranted and that the extent of the community zoning in the LAP is sufficient. It states that the site topography is unsuitable for community facilities and that recreational facilities do not need to be provided on serviceable land.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	The extent of the GN-C-01 zoning for community facilities and expansion of school and its suitability for same – consideration of residential use on site.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is acknowledged that an SHD is being progressed in relation to the site. The policies outlined in the submission of integrated land use and transport planning, consolidation of growth etc. have informed the zoning approach to Glounthaune. There is sufficient land zoned for residential development in Glounthaune to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan. Two of these are currently under construction and the other two are located close to the rail station and benefit from good pedestrian/cycle connectivity to same and to the village centre. Given the level of recent and planned growth in the settlement and the current lack of community facilities the zoning of land for community facilities is considered necessary. It is appropriate that the zoning for the school expansion is located beside the existing school. The location of community facilities beside the school will optimise their use. The need for a pedestrian/cycle link from the school to the village centre and residential development is recognised in the Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Save the batteries strand</b>
<b>DCDP346275374</b>	DCDP346275374
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that the council make the Batteries Strand an amenity for the people of Cobh.</p> <p>Outlines that this beach has been a popular bathing area for the people of Cobh for generations, that the access was recently blocked by the Council, and that it is one of two beaches available in the town centre.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Access to Batteries Strand.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The issue of access to the strand is an operational issue outside the remit of the County Development Plan.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Seamus Geaney</b>
<b>DCDP345920717</b>	DCDP345920717
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to circa 35 acres of greenfield land in Ballyleary, within the Cobh development boundary. The site is zoned Medium A density residential use and is within phase 1 of the Ballynoe Urban Expansion Area which is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>Clarification of the flexibility referred to in paragraph's 2.4.118 and 2.4.119 in Volume 4 to allow development to come forward in the Ballynoe Urban Expansion Area without significant infrastructure is requested to enable the landowner to develop the subject site and overcome the previous reasons for refusal ABP 301961-18. The Draft Plan should acknowledge the potential for infrastructure linkages between the 35 acre site and existing infrastructure such as Rushbrooke Rail Station and Cobh Rail Station, through the Council owned lands.</p> <p>Specific wording amendments to paragraph 2.4.119 in Volume 4 of the Draft Plan is requested.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Clarification regarding paragraphs 2.4.118 and 2.4.119 of the Draft Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The text referred to in the submission is as follows:</p> <p>2.4.118 Because of the importance of the Ballynoe lands to the overall delivery of new housing in Metropolitan Cork and because of its strategic location close to the Cobh railway line, the County Council is giving consideration to the potential for it to deliver the core infrastructure (including access roads, water services and particular areas of open space) that will enable individual parcels of zoned land to be developed independently of each other but in accordance with appropriate planning principles as set out in this plan. Once firm proposals are developed, the County Council will consult with landowners/developers and other stakeholders.</p> <p>2.4.119 In the interim, development proposals that can provide the necessary infrastructure can be considered for permission.</p> <p>This position remains as stated in the Plan. The progressing of the Cobh UEA is not yet at a sufficiently advanced stage to provide further clarification. The text above sets out the Council's intention to consult with landowners/developers and other stakeholders and it is not considered necessary to reiterate this.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Seán &amp; Geraldine O Leary</b>
<b>DCDP345968469</b>	DCDP345968469
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submitters agree with the draft plan as it relates to the Glounthaune area stating that it is a great strategy to keep developments on lower ground with excellent access to public transport systems.

	Submission also makes reference to development of area near school as extra space for expansion and development of sports facilities, protection of Dry Bridge, and the great asset of the current cycle & walking development.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support for development on lower ground with access to public transport.</li> <li>2. Expansion and development of sports facilities.</li> <li>3. Protection of Dry Bridge</li> <li>4. asset of the current cycle &amp; walking development</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support is noted.</li> <li>2. It seems that the submission supports GN-C-01 – this is noted.</li> <li>3. It seems that the submission supports the inclusion of the dry bridge on the RPS - this is noted.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sean Loftus of MSV (Cork) Ltd.,</b>
<b>DCDP346459209</b>	DCDP346459209
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to the site of a National Testing Centre for lorries, within the Metropolitan Greenbelt at Ballinahina, and where permission was previously granted for 3 additional industrial units and former nearby milk depot. Points to established industrial use and common access roadway between the two properties and to additional lands which it states are ideal for development. Seeks rezoning of the two sites and recognition of industrial use.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is an amendment to the Metropolitan Greenbelt appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Objective RP 5-16 of Chapter 5 Rural recognises the requirements of long established commercial uses located within the greenbelt which may make proposals for expansion / intensification of existing uses. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to exclude the subject lands from the greenbelt.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shane Healy</b>
<b>DCDP345983846</b>	DCDP345983846
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to CT-I-01 in Draft Plan and raises concerns regarding the zoning of land near The Elm Tree, Glounthaune, stating that there are already ample industrial zones in the surrounding areas of Little Island, Carrigtwohill IDA & Fota Business park which still have vacant sites. States that there is a turn-key, previously zoned, vacant industrial zone at a site east of Carrigtwohill, named Ballyadam and that to add another industrial area within such close proximity to the others mentioned will impact the already much reduced green areas within the community.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shane Healy</b>
<b>DCDP346254717</b>	DCDP346254717
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to CT-I-01 zoning at Carrigtwohill and states that in this area and nearby surrounding communities there are already ample industrial zoned lands, namely Little Island, Fota Business Park, Carrigtwohill IDA. Finds it difficult to understand why additional greenbelt lands need to be zoned for industrial use. States that there is currently an unused, untouched, "ready to go" industrial zoned large site at Ballyadam which is approx. 1KM east of Carrigtwohill and that it doesn't seem logical to zone additional lands when this site is lying idle. Asks for consideration of submission with a view to conserving already reducing green field areas in the communities of Little Island/Glounthaune/Carrigtwohill.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Finn</b>
<b>DCDP338022661</b>	DCDP338022661
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is a duplicate of DCDP337307775. See DCDP337307775
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	See DCDP337307775
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See DCDP337307775
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See DCDP337307775
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Finn</b>
<b>DCDP337307775</b>	DCDP337307775
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to the LI-X-01 zoning in Little Island. It submits that the land should accommodate a pub or restaurant, it envisages further population increase on Little Island and it seeks accommodation of a discount supermarket to cater for Little Island's population.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Scale of neighbourhood centre to be provided on LI-X-01
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The growth target for Little Island is concentrated within the LI-X-01 which is to deliver 500 residential units. In order to allow for this to be developed as a new sustainable residential neighbourhood it is considered necessary to provide a neighbourhood centre to serve the residents. It is envisaged that this would be a small scale, local neighbourhood centre and it is proposed to amend the wording of the objective to clarify this. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.5.8, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Little Island.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the wording of the objective to clarify the scale of the neighbourhood centre.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Simon Bursell</b>
<b>DCDP346167831</b>	DCDP346167831
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to land designated CT-I-01 in Carrigtwohill. Believes this is the wrong proposal and totally excessive as there are already huge sites zoned for industry nearby in both Little Island and Carrigtwohill, including the Amgen site at Carrigtwohill which has been empty for over a decade.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Teddy Holland</b>
<b>DCDP343857671</b>	DCDP343857671
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submits that growth of 10 units in Carrignavar over the plan period will not allow the village to fulfil its envisaged role as the primary focus for the development of the surrounding areas, stating that this fails to recognise development occurring in the wider area and the number of recent planning applications. It feels that the the vision and envisaged growth for the village will encourage a proliferation of septic tanks/treatment units, compromising public health and ground water quality. Reference is made to submitter's site , which had planning permission in 2007, and which currently lacks water infrastructure to adequately serve the site. States that the village needs houses and services and that the Development Plan must provide for adequate water services infrastructure within the timeframe of the plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	What is the most appropriate growth target for Carrignavar for the Plan period?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The growth target for the Plan period, of 10 units, has been identified with regard to the deficiency in wastewater infrastructure in the village. Upgrading of same is the responsibility of Irish Water. An upgrade to the service do not feature on their investment plan. In the absence of such plans the Planning Authority considers that a relatively low growth target for the village of 10 units is the most responsible approach to take. There is ample land within the development boundary of the village to accommodate this target and an expansion of the boundary is not necessary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Teresa O'Mahony</b>
<b>DCDP346277578</b>	DCDP346277578
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Relates to land in Carrigtwohill zoned CT-I-01 in the plan. States that Carrigtwohill and Little Island are a wonderful source of employment in the area and applauds their industry but indicates that there is a lot of land already zoned for industrial development that is lying idle.  Submits that this land is an area of natural beauty, a valley and hillside that catches the eye on arriving from the East and that there is a shortage of parks

	and natural amenities in the area. Asks for it to be left as farm land or purchased as a park amenity for the area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the CT-I-01 zoning, and its extent, appropriate?</li> <li>2. Would a park/amenity area be an appropriate use of the site?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.</li> <li>2. Sufficient land has been identified within the development boundaries of Glounthaune and Carrigtwohill for recreation/amenity use.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See key issue in volume 1, Part 1, Cobh MD, Carrigtwohill.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Therese Horgan</b>
<b>DCDP346491828</b>	DCDP346491828
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submitter seeks a residential zoning for land zoned GA-01 in Knockraha in the Draft Plan as land accommodates her family's home and farm, submitting that it cannot be used for open space.</p> <p>Proposes an alternative green infrastructure zoning to the north of the village.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Provision of active open space in Knockraha.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site zoned GA-01, proximate to the school and existing residential development is considered to be the most suitable site for the provision of active open space. Issues of ownership and site availability can change and as such it is the suitability of the site for the land use proposed that has determined the zoning of this site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom Aherne</b>
<b>DCDP344750872</b>	DCDP344750872
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission from GAA club, based in Caherlag, primarily relates to the provision of community facilities for Glounthaune residents.</p> <p>Welcomes zoning for additional community facilities in Glounthaune (GN-C-01) but questions who would provide such facilities. Points out that the land is currently subject to a live planning application for housing and proposes that the Council would recommend an alternative and more attainable site for community use.</p> <p>Suggests Ashbourne House as an obvious choice for a tennis/basketball court due to existence of tennis court there, and asks if it could be retained by developer. With reference to sports hall aspect of C-01 it states that one exists at Erin's Own, as well as a creche and astro turf complex.</p> <p>Outlines social as well as sporting significance of Erin's Own GAA club, including to nearby residents of new estates and direct provision centre (Glounthaune and Ballinglanna). States that they are running out of recreational space. Seeks prioritisation of most commonly played sports for land that may be come available for recreation use and outlines that request for use of sports hall for basketball have not been made. Quantifies current numbers of GAA participants at Caherlag. It asks if provision for amenity/community grounds close to Caherlag and Erin's Own's facility would be more suitable than GN-C-01 zoning.</p>

	Highlights the importance of a pathway providing pedestrian connectivity between Caherlag pitch, Glounthaune school and Glounthaune cycleway. Expresses gratitude for Council funding received in the past.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Would the provision for amenity/community grounds close to Caherlag and Erin's Own's facility be more suitable than the GN-C-01 zoning?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Given the level of recent and planned growth in Glounthaune it is important to provide for community facilities in Glounthaune to deliver the liveable town/ten minute town concept and serve the needs of the residents of the village. Lands at Caherlag are more remote from residential development in Glounthaune than GN-C-01 which adjoins existing residential development. While neither currently benefit from a pedestrian link to the village centre the Plan highlights the need for a pedestrian link between the school and the village centre and residential developments which would also serve the GN-C-01.</p> <p>Erin's Own GAA club is located in the Metropolitan greenbelt the overall objective of which is to reserve greenbelt land generally for use as agriculture, open space, and recreation (Objectives RP 5-12 and RP 5-13). Any proposed expansion of Erin's Own may be considered independently of the development of community facilities in Glounthaune. Any built development associated with the club should not compromise the specific function and character of the greenbelt in that particular area.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed. See however recommended amendments in relation to Ashbourne House. NO. 4.2.8.1, NO. 4.2.8.2, NO 4.2.8.3, volume 2, part 2, Cobh MD, Glounthaune.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom Maher</b>
<b>DCDP343501745</b>	DCDP343501745
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Relates to land that is within the development boundary of Glounthaune in the 2017 LAP and that lies outside it in the Draft CDP. Requests that the land be included within the development boundary of Glounthaune and be zoned for residential use.</p> <p>Sets out the locational context of the site (walking distance of school, and within c1km of other services), including reference to Glounthaune's rail link and proximity to employment.</p> <p>Sets out planning policy context, including level of growth envisaged for the village in the LAP, focusing on integrated transport and land use planning. References importance of Metropolitan Cork in the development of the Cork Gateway as an integrated planning unit. References some of the supporting infrastructure required for enhanced Cork Suburban Rail Services (improvements at Glounthaune Junction, and double track between Glounthaune and Midleton), makes references to CMATS anticipation of more modest housing growth at Glounthaune, and to CMATS statement that consolidation will further support the viability of the rail corridor. Sets out key NPF NSOs of relevance to Glounthaune as well as RSES RPO 10 and other references of relevance to the concept of integrated land use and transport planning.</p> <p>Outlines a rationale for submission request: sustainable transport infrastructure in Glounthaune (rail link, cycleway); range of local services; site within walking distance of school, GAA facility and other services and c.1km from public</p>



	<p>transport corridor; site availability and deliverability (availability of supporting infrastructure); adjoins existing development; benefits from natural screening; necessity of ensuring sufficient, deliverable lands are zoned to meet growth target for Glounthaune; capacity of Glounthaune to successfully integrate land use and transport planning.</p> <p>Makes reference to SHD application being progressed for adjacent site and the connectivity that it could provide to the village centre, as well as facilitating sequential development of submission site. Points to investment made by developer to deliver SHD.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it necessary to expand the development boundary of Glounthaune? / Is the subject site more suitable than existing zoned lands within the development boundary of Glounthaune?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>There is sufficient land within the development boundary of Glounthaune to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that an SHD is being progressed in relation to the site. The policies outlined in the submission of integrated land use and transport planning and consolidation of growth have informed the zoning approach to Glounthaune. Of the sites currently zoned for residential development, two are currently under construction and the other two are located close to the rail station and benefit from good pedestrian/cycle connectivity to same and to the village centre.</p> <p>The need for a pedestrian/cycle link from the school to the village centre and residential development is recognised in the Plan however it is not considered that it is necessary to include the subject site within the development boundary to deliver this.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>W Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345938942</b>	DCDP345938942
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands at Gogganstown, Knockraha be included within the development boundary of the village for small scale one off housing to supplement the village. A map, showing the lands referred to, is provided in the submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is an amendment to the development boundary of Knockraha required?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The level of growth identified for Knockraha in the Plan reflects the absence of adequate waste water and water supply services. There is ample land within the development boundary to accommodate that growth and expansion of the development boundary is not therefore appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Watergrasshill Community Association - Planning &amp; Development Action Group</b>
<b>DCDP345562420</b>	DCDP345562420

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Proposes development of a secondary school, extended recreational land, amendment to WT-B-01 and extension of village development boundary.</p> <p>Makes reference to recent and planned population growth in Watergrasshill submitting that this growth must occur with adequate provision of appropriate amenities. Gives details of primary school enrolment figures and states that there is a need for a secondary school in Watergrasshill. It suggests that a secondary school in Watergrasshill could accommodate children from Leamlara, Kockraha and Bartlemy relieving pressure on schools in Midleton and Carrigtwohill. It submits that diocesan land would be ideal for the school and that the former priest's house and grounds could provide an administrative building for the school. Sets out a plan for a secondary school and community field development within WT-X-01.</p> <p>Also proposes extension to WT-GC-01 and sets out an impression of how part of it can be rewilded and part can be for community recreation use.</p> <p>Proposes that the WT-B-01 zoning is not an appropriate use, stating that it has been zoned as such and undeveloped for at least 20 years. Asks that it be rezoned for amenity, residential or retail so that it is used.</p> <p>Proposes extensions to the development boundary to the south and north east of the village.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secondary school.</li> <li>2. Extension to WT-GC-01.</li> <li>3. Alternative use of employment land in Watergrasshill.</li> <li>4. Is an extension to the development boundary required to meet the growth target?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify a need for a secondary school in Watergrasshill.</li> <li>2. It is proposed to extend WT-GC-01 to include a small area of adjoining land to the south east of the zoning. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.9.2, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD, Watergrasshill.</li> <li>3. The WT-B-01 zoning of the site is considered to be appropriate. Amenity, residential or retail use is already provided for in the village in Green Infrastructure, Residential, and Town Centre zonings respectively. The special policy area , WT-X-01, may accommodate residential, retail and community uses and adjoins the village centre. It is intended that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan the Planning Authority will complete a business land availability study which will inform the need for any future changes to employment land provision.</li> <li>4. A revision of the Core Strategy of the Plan has identified a requirement for an additional 59 residential units to be delivered during the lifetime of the plan. Additional zoning has been identified adjoining an existing residential development that is currently being developed. See PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.9.3, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD and PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO 1.2.14, Volume 2, Part 1, Core Strategy.</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend WT-GC-01 to include a small area of additional land. Amend the development boundary of Watergrasshill to include additional land for residential development to the south west of the village.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Wayleaf Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346052418</b>	DCDP346052418
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>They endorse the inclusion of their lands within the Draft County Development Plan (Draft CDP) residential zoning objective CH-R-12 and that they are taking active measures to complete the 'Inis Alainn' estate-</p> <p>They obtained planning permission (19/4376) (as amended by 20/4244) for the construction of 69 no. dwellings on land to the south of the subject site. They recently submitted a further application for 71 no. units in the northern areas of the site.</p> <p>While they support the residential zoning as identified by CH-R-12 of the draft CDP they outline concerns regarding the requirement to provide a nursing home.</p> <p>They submit that this is not a suitable location for a nursing home and it would not be consistent with national guidance and is also at variance with objectives relating to appropriate locations for residential care accommodation in the Draft CDP.</p> <p>They submit proposed wording for CL-R-12 as follows "Medium A Density residential development to include a mix of house types and sizes."</p> <p>They refer to the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Framework (NPF), 'Access to Quality Childcare, Education and Health Services'. National Policy Objective (NPO) 4. They note that NPO27, seeks to improve existing communities by ensuring that design prioritises walking and cycling accessibility and integrating physical activity for all ages. They note that NPO30 states that local planning policies reflect the specific needs and requirements of the elderly population.</li> <li>• Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), specifically section 7.1.14 which promotes 'Age Friendly Communities'. Further, they note that Regional Policy Objective (RPO) 182 supports Smart Ageing and National Positive Ageing policies and An Garda Síochána Older People Strategy to ensure that local planning, transport/accessibility and leisure policies meet the needs and opportunities of an ageing population. Reference is made to RPO163 Sustainable Mobility Targets. They note that this can be achieved by focussing employment opportunities where sustainable travel is a viable alternative to travelling by car.</li> <li>• Cork County Development Plan (CDP), specifically paragraph 5.4.14 which states that appropriate locations for residential care is within settlements to enhance overall quality of life and increase accessibility to local amenities and thus avoid social isolation. Reference is made to CDP Objectives SC 6-1 'Healthcare Facilities', SC 7-1 'Cork an Age</li> </ul>

	<p>Friendly County’ and SC 7-3 ‘Accommodation for Older Persons’ which aim to ensure healthcare facilities are provided at appropriate locations with good public transport links, that a range of suitable facilities are provided and a commitment to establish policy and targets regarding the provision of residential care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cobh Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (Cobh LAP) they refer to Objective CH-GO-11 which requires that all commercial and employment uses should maximise public transport opportunities to promote sustainable travel and commuting patterns.</li> <li>• Objective HOU 4-3 of the draft CDP ‘Housing for Older People’ which supports the delivery of housing suitable for older people on infill, opportunity and regeneration sites within towns and villages. They note that the draft CDP promotes an ‘Age Friendly County’ at paragraphs 6.61 – 6.6.23 which echoes the requirement of HOU 4-3.</li> </ul> <p>They consider that the Draft CDP advice regarding appropriate locations for nursing homes are sound and consistent with national and regional guidance.</p> <p>They note that the Draft CDP identifies one potential location for a nursing home in Cobh which is the subject site. They consider the location is removed from the town centre, associated services and amenities which is contrary to policy. They consider that the subject location is inconsistent with the provision of an ‘age friendly society’. It also goes against guidance within RPO163 promoting sustainable commuting patterns and Cobh LAP Objective CH-GO-11.</p> <p>They note that the subject site is in the north-eastern extent of Cobh and within open countryside with topographical challenges which would cause mobility issues for the elderly or infirm.</p> <p>They refer to the 2016 census figures and note that 11.5% of Cobh’s population were over 65 which is a lower percentage of Cork County which is 13%. They note that Cobh Community Hospital has capacity for 44 no. elderly patients and upon review of HIQA’s most recent inspection from July 2020 there was additional capacity for 6 no. potential residents.</p> <p>They note there are several other nursing/residential care homes in the wider area.</p> <p>They refer to recent grants of planning permission for nursing homes.</p> <p>They note that nursing homes have very specific operational requirements with site selection a critical consideration. They note that it is an operational reality that edge of settlement locations is unattractive and that locations within existing urban centres with convenient access to local amenities is considered best practice.</p> <p>Further they note that the non-suitability of the subject site for a nursing home is evidenced by the fact that the permitted nursing home was never built, despite marketing and there has been no commercial operator interest.</p>
--	---

	<p>They submit that should the Planning Authority decide that a site for a nursing home is required for Cobh that they are more appropriate locations for such a facility which comply with policy.</p> <p>They refer to another submission regarding land within CH-B-01. They consider it to be an appropriate site which accords with the policy set out above. They note the as part of this submission an estate agent states that CH-B-01 lands are commercially attractive for a potential nursing home operator.</p> <p>To conclude they request that the current requirement to provide a nursing home on the CH-R-12 zoning objective be removed based on non-suitability and non-compliance with governing policy.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Location of provision for nursing home in Cobh.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Provision has been made in the Plan for a nursing home within CH-R-12 as such provision is considered necessary for the town. A submission has been received in relation to a 0.87 Ha site within CH-B-01 which the submitter wishes to have zoned for the provision of a retirement village. The site within CH-B-01 is similar to CH-R-12 in its distance from the town centre. It is located close to the Ticknock neighbourhood centre, and will be served by CH-U-09 (upgrading of Ticknock Road to include pedestrian and cycle facilities). Alternative land has not been identified closer to the town centre. See proposed amendments NO. 4.2.4.18 and NO. 4.2.4.17, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD of this report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the text of CH-R-12 to exclude the requirement for a nursing home and amend the zoning map to exclude an area from CH-B-01 and to identify it as CH-C-05. Include new specific objective text for CH-C-05 Nursing home.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Whitechurch Development Committee</b>
<b>DCDP345906540</b>	DCDP345906540
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission provides background information regarding Whitechurch, the Whitechurch Development Committee, Whitechurch and Waterloo Community Association CLG and the community facilities in Whitechurch.</p> <p>The submission seeks provision for an extension to the existing cemetery in Whitechurch, and an extension to the footpath north of the village to Dromgarraff Lane (1km approx.) to create a 7km Sli na Slainte Loop walk.</p> <p>T-O1 zoning for mixed use development to include a crèche, a community playground and street frontage development along eastern boundary is welcomed.</p> <p>Improved local services and public transport connections for Whitechurch are requested.</p> <p>Development should be of an appropriate density and in keeping with the scale of a village.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Extension of cemetery.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Extension of footpath.</li> <li>3. T-01 zoning supported.</li> <li>4. Need for improved local services and public transport.</li> <li>5. Density and scale of development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expansion of the cemetery can be considered through normal development management procedures.</li> <li>2. It is proposed to amend the draft plan to allow consideration of a pedestrian/cycleway to extend from the north of the village to Dromgarraff Lane to facilitate the creation of a Slí na Sláinte Loop walk. PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4.2.13.1, Volume 2, Part 2, Cobh MD</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> <li>4. Local services such as retail, community services, etc. may be considered within the T-01 zoning. The provision of public transport is outside the remit of the County Development Plan however the need for same is highlighted in the Plan.</li> <li>5. Objective CS 2-7 Network of Settlements – Lower Order Settlements, (chapter 2m Core Strategy) sets out a strategic objective to Encourage and facilitate development at a scale, layout and design that reflects the character of each village, where water services and waste water infrastructure is available and support the retention and improvement of key social and community facilities within villages, including the improved provision of inter urban public transport. Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking guides the delivery of compact growth in towns and villages.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend paragraph 2.13.8 to include text to allow consideration of a pedestrian/cycleway to extend from the north of the village.

Volume Four -South Cork – East Cork Municipal District.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Aileen Hackett</b>
<b>DCDP345335979</b>	DCDP345335979
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to any further zoning at Broomfield Village which it states would have a negative impact on existing houses and damage the environment with long term clearing of the site. The submission states that there are no amenities in the area such as shops when compared to Water-Rock which will be a purpose-built housing development with amenities.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.  It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Aileen Lehane</b>
<b>DCDP344415177</b>	DCDP344415177
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton. The submission refers to existing issues with noise, dust and traffic in Broomfield Village due to ongoing development. The submission states that further residential development in the area will add to these issues as well as having a negative visual impact on the hill behind Broomfield Village which will devalue the area and the price of property.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.  It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Aisling Mulhall</b>
<b>DCDP344414743</b>	DCDP344414743
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 in Broomfield, Midleton. The submission states that the zoning of this site appears to be in



	contradiction with objectives RP-5-13, GI-8-1 and GI-14-9 (parts d and e) of the Draft Cork County Development Plan which relate to the protection of the Metropolitan Greenbelt and the Landscape. The submission states that the zoning of this site should be reconsidered due to its elevated nature, the lack of infrastructure to support a development of this size and due to the extensive area of land already zoned in Water-Rock.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Alex Wilsdon</b>
<b>DCDP345476425</b>	DCDP345476425
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to previous residential lands in Ballinacurra, Midleton being changed to agriculture (AG-02) zoning in the Draft CDP 2021. The submission states that these lands were entered by Cork County Council on the 2018 Vacant Sites Register and which Cork County Council joined with An Bord Pleanala to defend in a Judicial review.</p> <p>The submission states that it is not credible that these lands are now deemed to be "unsuitable for housing" in the Draft Plan given the highly selective nature of Cork County Council's process for inclusion in the 2018 Vacant Sites Register.</p> <p>The submission also points out that the failure to identify a large area of other lands as being "suitable for housing provision" when compiling the VSR in 2018 is at stark contrast to the assessment of those lands in the draft plan as now being most suitable for housing delivery.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Requests that a residential zoning on lands at Ballinacurra be reinstated as these lands were entered by Cork Council on the 2018 Vacant Sites Register. Lands have an agriculture zoning in the draft plan. Also queries why other lands, which were not identified as being suitable for housing provision in Midleton when compiling the VSR, are now included in the draft plan for residential development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Lands are to be included as a Residential Reserve Zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.17

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anthony Flavin</b>
<b>DCDP346277568</b>	DCDP346277568
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Foxhole in Youghal be included inside the development boundary for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses. The land is .6 ha in area and adjoins Youghal Commercial Park.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands at Foxhole be included inside the development boundary of Youghal and zoned for existing mixed/general business/industrial uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	In the draft Plan, the majority of the site is already within the development boundary and is zoned existing mixed/ general business / industrial uses. However, the revised flood risk map for Youghal shows a large portion of the site is within flood zone A. Development of the site will therefore need to comply with the provisions of chapter 11 of the Plan, as amended. No change proposed
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ashley Cahalane</b>
<b>DCDP329016153</b>	DCDP329016153
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following issues in relation to Youghal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of derelict, vacant and neglected buildings particularly along the Main street up to the clock tower.</li> <li>• There is a need to attract business to the town.</li> <li>• There is a need for more amenities for families including a playground near the beach.</li> <li>• The public toilets are an eyesore and require upgrading.</li> <li>• There is a need for lights along the board walk for night-time use.</li> <li>• There is a need for more plants, trees and flowers throughout the town.</li> <li>• The international college is one of the most beautiful buildings in Youghal with gardens and trees which cannot be viewed by the public due to the high wall blocking it. The submission states that this is a wasted opportunity for a space for people to enjoy.</li> <li>• The Greyhound racing track and exterior wall is an eye sore on the approach road to the town. The submission states that the wall should be knocked and the track opened up for kids athletics.</li> <li>• The Perks site is very neglected and needs attention.</li> <li>• There is a need for modern shopping facilities throughout town of Youghal while respecting and highlighting the towns rich history. The submission gives the example of 'Blackheath' village in London.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>Submission highlights a number of issues in Youghal;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Derelict and neglected buildings particularly along the Main Street and at the Perks Site to the west of the town.</li> <li>2. The need to attract business to the town.</li> <li>3. The requirement for more amenities in the town including a playground, public toilets'</li> <li>4. The need for lighting along the boardwalk and plants and flowers throughout the town.</li> </ol>

	5. The need for more modern shopping facilities.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan acknowledges that a key area to be targeted in the town centre is that of dereliction and vacancy levels, particularly along the main street. Volume 1, Chapter 9 includes an objective TCR 9-2 includes an objective which Promote the appropriate revitalisation of vacant and derelict properties and to facilitate the adaptation of existing property in town centre areas for retail, residential and other town centre activities. To encouraging the merging of buildings to create larger commercial footprints where this is appropriate within the context of the town.</li> <li>• The derelict nature of the Seafield/Perks site on the approach to the town is also recognised in the plan. The site has been designated as a regeneration site in the plan YL-R-05 and includes an objective YL-X-01 for its redevelopment.</li> <li>• Continued improvements to public realm in the town will help to restore business confidence in the town as a whole.</li> <li>• Youghal has a number of attractive public parks. The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. See Paragraph 14.5.5. The need for additional recreational facilities in Youghal, including playgrounds, will be reviewed in the preparation of this policy.</li> <li>• General Objective YL-GO-08 sets out a requirement to protect and enhance the attractive landscape character setting of the town including the development of regeneration areas and public realm improvements.</li> <li>• Cork County Council Tourism Department has made substantial progress on a number of tourism initiatives including the redevelopment of beach amenities including the launch of the Youghal Boardwalk Project which was opened in June 2021. This phase saw an extension of the existing boardwalk from Claycastle beach out to Redbarn beach, both of which were awarded the prestigious Blue Flag for 2021, significantly enhancing the 'beach experience' for visitors.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Athena Private Assets Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346295788</b>	DCDP346295788
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the zoning objective for the X-01 site located at Mill Road/Northern Relief Road Midleton be amended. The wording of the objective in the draft is;</p> <p>“Mixed use residential and office development. Provision may also be made for small scale retail units at ground floor level, with office and/or residential uses at upper floor levels appropriate to a mixed-use urban neighbourhood.”</p> <p>The submission requests that the zoning for this site be amended to allow a predominantly residential development to occur that is in keeping with the</p>

	<p>existing residential nature of this part of the site. It states that there are vacant commercial units in the adjoining retail park at Market Green and a predominantly commercial scheme would be both unviable and unsuitable.</p> <p>The submission therefore proposes the following objective for the site;</p> <p>“Residential, mixed-use residential and office development. Provision may also be made for small scale retail units at ground floor level, with office and/or residential uses at upper floor levels appropriate to a mixed use urban neighbourhood.”</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should objective X-01 in Midleton be amended to allow for a predominantly residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The X-01 lands in Midleton are located in an area of Flood Risk. It is considered that due to the extensive flood risk on this site it is no longer feasible to zone all the site for residential, office or retail uses. The site will be reduced in size accordingly and a smaller portion of the site will be included for mixed use residential and office development. The remainder of the site will be included as part of Green Infrastructure Objective MD-GR-03.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.18.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bernadette Fitzgerald</b>
<b>DCDP343860306</b>	DCDP343860306
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises a number of concerns in relation to existing residential development at Broomfield Village in Midleton and plans for further development in the area.</p> <p>The submission states that development at Blossomhill is still ongoing with construction traffic significantly impacting on Meadowlands Lane. The submission also refers to soil which has been excavated from the Blossomhill development and currently stored on the site to the north (MD-R-27). There is concern expressed that this soil will need to be removed through the Meadowlands estate route at some point.</p> <p>The submission also states that future housing developments should be within the existing boundary of Midleton town and focus on utilising current building stock, prioritising brownfield sites and underutilised lands. The submission states that these areas and existing zoned residential lands should be developed first in addition to the use of buildings and land adjacent to the Cork-Midleton railway line before extending Midleton to a site 10 minutes outside the town.</p> <p>The submission would also welcome the construction of the Northern Relief Road for the town.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.

	<p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>BLCC Ladysbridge Tidy Towns Committee</b>
<b>DCDP342979519</b>	DCDP342979519
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission from the Ladysbridge Tidy Towns Committee refers to three major issues for residents of the village which are as follows;</p> <p>1) The lack of a suitable footpath connecting Ladysbridge to Castlemartyr which would allow people to use the public transport services in the village of Castlemartyr. The submission requests that this be reconsidered given the poor bus service in Ladysbridge. The submission expresses disappointment that an application for funding to prepare a feasibility and cost assessment of providing a footpath between Castlemartyr GAA and Ladysbridge was not approved, particularly given that the Dept. of Transport has recently announced a €50 million walking and cycling fund for towns and villages. The submission refers to the Ladysbridge forest trail which it states is a nice amenity but not suitable for vulnerable users or buggies.</p> <p>2) The lack of green space or recreation areas in the village. The submission proposes the development of a park/green space that could be used by all age groups.</p> <p>3) Lack of childcare facilities. The submission states that there is a lack of childcare places in Ladysbridge and Castlemartyr and that a purpose-built crèche should be part of any future housing development in the village of Ladysbridge as it is an essential amenity.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of a footpath connecting Ladysbridge to Castlemartyr.</li> <li>2. Lack of childcare, green spaces and recreation areas in Ladysbridge.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cork County Council has sought funding from the NTA to conduct a feasibility study to identify costings for the provision of a link footpath from Castlemartyr GAA grounds to Ladysbridge. The NTA has not approved funding at this time.</li> <li>2. Text to be included in the East Cork MD plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village of Ladysbridge including childcare and sports facilities. The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. See Paragraph 14.5.5.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Blossom Wheatley Residents Association</b>
<b>DCDP345658375</b>	DCDP345658375

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 for residential development at Broomfield, Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</li> <li>• Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>• Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2)Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</li> <li>• Social infrastructure. The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) The proposal would be in conflict with Objective GI 8-1: Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt Areas requiring Special Protection of the County Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brendan Kearney</b>
<b>DCDP341707599</b>	DCDP341707599
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to the proposed zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton. The submission states that the proposed rezoning of this site for residential development is inappropriate given the elevated nature of the site. The submission also refers to the lack of sufficient infrastructure, including road infrastructure, to support such a significant increase in the local population and states that this infrastructure needs to be in place before any such development is considered.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.  It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian and Carmel Kavanagh</b>
<b>DCDP340452032</b>	DCDP340452032
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian Glynn</b>
<b>DCDP342703901</b>	DCDP342703901
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to the proposed zoning of land for residential development at Broomfield in Midleton. The submission welcomes the proposal in context however it states that it is vital that any residential



	proposals are developed on the condition that the Northern Relief Road is completed in advance due to the impact increased traffic would have on the Broomfield spine road which, the submission states, is already at capacity with high volumes of traffic including HGVs.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian Hughes</b>
<b>DCDP345979569</b>	DCDP345979569
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Unsuitability of the Site; The proposed site extremely elevated and clearly visible from the town.</li> <li>2) Loss of Privacy; Development on this site will result in loss of privacy and loss of light to the adjoining estates. Proposals to build high density apartment blocks will back directly onto houses in the adjoining Blossom Hill estate.</li> <li>3) The development of the site will result in destruction of the hill side over the next 10 years resulting in massive earthworks and excessive dust emissions and noise pollution from construction traffic.</li> <li>4) Unsuitability of the existing road infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic between Broomfield and the Northern Relief Road.</li> <li>5) Lack of social and community facilities; The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> <li>6) More suitable sites available in areas such as Water-Rock and Baneshane which are flat and have existing schools such as the new Gaelscoil.</li> </ol>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.

	<p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian Jordan</b>
<b>DCDP344070148</b>	DCDP344070148
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Baneshane in Midleton be zoned for residential development. The lands which are contiguous to the development boundary are currently located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that given the sites strategic location in close proximity to schools, the town centre, roads and infrastructure it is ideally suited to residential development.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to zone additional land for residential development at Baneshane?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary of Midleton at this time as it is considered that there is a sufficient amount of land already within the boundary to cater for the proposed population increase for the town over the life of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian O Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP346128163</b>	DCDP346128163
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that the road infrastructure in Ballycotton is in need of significant improvements to support the objectives of the Development Plan. Barrack Hill and Chapel Rd are inadequate to support the delivery of housing from proposed zoned lands.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to improve the road infrastructure at Ballycotton to support the objectives of the Development Plan?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority has no plans at this time to advance road improvements of this nature in Ballycotton. It is envisaged that any such improvements, if required, would be developer led and funded. Also, it should be noted that there are no lands zoned for residential development in Ballycotton.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian O Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP346279622</b>	DCDP346279622
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission highlights the need for road improvements in Ballycotton at Main Street / Barrack Hill Junction as highlighted in Cork County Councils

	<p>response to recent planning applications in the vicinity of this junction. Cork County Council have stated "proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard".</p> <p>The submission therefore proposes that a development objective could be included in the CDP for Local Authority led road infrastructure works to serve the local residents and the community. The submission also proposes that future small scale housing developments be permitted to service housing need in the village.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for road improvements in Ballycotton at the junction of Main Street/Barrack Hill.</li> <li>2. Is there a need for small scale housing developments in the village?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Planning Authority has no plans at this time to advance road improvements of this nature in Ballycotton. It is envisaged that any such improvements, if required, would be developer led and funded. Also, it should be noted that there are no lands zoned for residential development in Ballycotton</li> <li>2. Objective DB-01 of the Draft Plan provides for the development of 45 dwelling units in the village over the life of the plan, subject to compliance with the objectives of the plan. This can include small scale housing developments.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>C O' Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP344573353</b>	DCDP344573353
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following concerns in relation to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Unsuitability of the site due its steep nature. The levelling of the site will result in substantial earthworks during the course of the development which will result in years of excessive dust, emissions, and noise pollution. The submission states that there are already problems with surface water run-off in the existing Blossom Hill estate and that the development of a larger site could result in more problems.</li> <li>2) Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>3) Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls.</li> <li>4) Lack of Adequate Services. The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services including roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights into Broomfield.</li> </ol>

<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Castle Rock Homes (Midleton) Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346118494</b>	DCDP346118494
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands at Broomfield in Midleton. The lands form part of MC-GC-01 (Green Infrastructure Conservation) for which the objective in the Draft Plan states that, 'The area forms an important visual buffer to the railway line and creates an open space for informal recreation'. The site is presently zoned for Open Space in the 2017 East Cork LAP. The submission requests that the subject lands be omitted from the wider MD-GC-01 Draft CDP objective and included within the general 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' objective for Midleton. Castlerock Homes are currently seeking permission for the construction of a single storey creche and multi-use games area for public use at the subject site (20/6557) for which further information has been sought by the Council.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands that are zoned for open space as part of the Broomfield residential development be re zoned for allow for development of a creche and other others.?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that these lands should be retained as public open space in keeping with the original layout of the Broomfield development and as originally permitted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Castle Rock Homes (Midleton) Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346122060</b>	DCDP346122060
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands at Broomfield which are in the ownership of Castle Rock Homes. The submission supports the inclusion of a portion of their lands at Broomfield West however the submission also requests that the remainder of the lands be included in the settlement boundary of Midleton and zoned for 'agricultural' use.</p> <p>The submission supports MD-R-27 which it states is consistent with the 10-minute town concept promoted by the RSES and the Public Transport Orientated Development (PTOD) within CMATS. The submission proposes that the remainder of the lands be designated as Agriculture consistent with the function of 'AG' objectives as described in paragraph 18.3.5 of the Draft CDP.</p>

	<p>'The purpose of this zoning is to provide for the development of agriculture by ensuring the retention of agricultural uses and protect the lands from undesirable development while providing a clear demarcation of the adjoining areas. These lands have been identified as having the potential to play a role in the delivery of future residential development in the period after 2028.'</p> <p>In a previous submission to the Draft CDP Issues Paper in June 2020 Castle Rock Homes made a submission which has also been attached to this submission. This includes a comprehensive masterplan for the wider landholding including MD-R-27.</p> <p>The submission is made in the context of national, regional and local planning policy outlined in the NPF, The Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan, the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region, the current Cork County Development Plan 2014 and the East Cork Local Area Plan 2017.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands to the east of MD-R-27 at Broomfield be included for agriculture to ensure the retention of agricultural uses and protect the lands from undesirable development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p> <p>Lands east of MD R -27 are in the greenbelt and are not required over the life of the Plan. The suitability of these lands for development is a matter for the future reviews of the plan and it would be premature of consider it at this stage. No change proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Catherine Wiley</b>
<b>DCDP339372230</b>	DCDP339372230
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Centre Park Developments Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP346214430</b>	DCDP346214430
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission from Centre Park Developments relates to land at Watersedge, Midleton, some 350m west of Main Street, and seeks a town centre zoning for the site. The site previously formed part of a larger development site including lands now developed to the north (Aldi etc.) and other undeveloped lands to the south. The zoning of the lands changed following the publication of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines and, under the Midleton Town Plan 2013 the site is zoned as OS2- Open Space / Sports/ Recreation and Amenity. In the Draft Plan 2021, the site is included within a larger green infrastructure zoning MD-GC-16. Submission acknowledges that the site is at risk of flooding and that flood risk is a substantive issue that must be addressed. It is noted that detailed hydraulic modelling of the site is needed to further inform the issue, but that is not possible within the timeframe for making a submission to the Draft Plan. It is stated that the Council has this modelling information available to it. Submission considers that a technical solution could be developed to flooding to allow the site to be developed and that it could meet the requirements of the Justification Test as set out in the Flood Risk Management Guidelines. Submission notes that many other zoned sites in the plan are also at risk of flooding. Submission references National, Regional and Local planning policy provisions is setting out a case as to how the development of the site could support the strategic vision for Midleton, complete the development of this part of the town centre, west of the river, and enhance connectivity with the pontoon walk and between the Dwyer Road Enterprise Park and the town centre. Development would also provide passive surveillance to the adjoining walks and open space. Submission includes an indicative proposal for how the site could accommodate a mixed use development of retail / active uses at ground floor level and residential overhead, addressing the river frontage and the open space to south.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands which presently form part of MD-GC-16 in Midleton be zoned for town centre uses including residential development at 1st floor level?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>These undeveloped greenfield lands adjoin the River Owenacurra and the tidal estuary and are at risk of flooding - Flood Zone A. Guidelines on flood risk management indicate that development should be avoided in areas at risk of flooding. There are ample alternative lands available in Midleton, which are not at risk of flooding, to cater for the development needs of the town and town centre uses.</p> <p>The lands are ideally situated beside the pontoon walkway to be developed as a public open space amenity area for the town, either as a standalone</p>

	space or in conjunction with the redevelopment of Dwyer's Road Enterprise Park /Regeneration site / X-02 site. No change proposed
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Chriselle Holdings Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP336703768</b>	DCDP336703768
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that 6.6ha of lands at Glanagow, Whitegate be rezoned from 'Green Infrastructure' to 'Industry'. It is suggested that the inclusion of these additional land for industrial uses as part of WG-I-04, would facilitate a broader range of options for the layout of lands currently zoned for industry, while still maintaining a significant area of surrounding 'Green Infrastructure designated WG-GC-16.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to change the zoning of lands in Whitegate from 'Green Infrastructure' (WG-GC-16) to 'Industry'?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>There is currently approximately 60ha of greenfield land zoned for industrial use as part of WG-I – 04 that remains undeveloped with no planning history. The lands surround the proposed site to be rezoned to the north, east and west.</p> <p>The location is at the top of a hill and is visually very exposed and unscreened.</p> <p>The 6.6ha proposed to be rezoned from green infrastructure to industry has no road frontage and could only be developed as part of the wider block, all of which must be accessed from the east or through the power plant to the north. There can therefore be no immediate need for development at this location as there is much undeveloped land between this plot and the access points. The objective for WG I-04 requires extensive structural landscaping on both the industrial lands and the adjoining green infrastructure site WG – GC-16. Structural landscaping is also required on green infrastructure site WG – GC-16 site (including on the lands proposed for rezoning to industry).</p> <p>It is considered that adequate lands have already been provided for industrial use and proposed lands should remain as part of the green infrastructure objective to help lessen the visual impact of new industrial development on this visually sensitive harbour site.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Chriselle Holdings Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344427058</b>	DCDP344427058
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Cloyne be zoned for residential development. The lands are located to the south of the village outside the development boundary and are contiguous to CY-R-03 residential lands. The lands are 7.6ha in area and are covered by the 'Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence' Rural Housing Policy.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Cloyne to include additional land for residential development?



<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary of Cloyne to allow for residential development. It is considered that there is a sufficient amount of land located within the existing development boundary to cater for the proposed level of population growth in the village over the lifetime of this plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cian Fleming</b>
<b>DCDP343275685</b>	DCDP343275685
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission states that further development at Broomfield is not feasible for the area due to traffic congestion, school access, apartments on an elevated site and lack of privacy. The submission suggests that other options for residential development such as Water-Rock are more suitable.</p> <p>The submission also states that the current development at Broomfield Village is ongoing and outlines a number of concerns in relation to the estate. The submission suggests that there are matters outstanding in Broomfield Village which the developer has so far failed to address.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands at Broomfield have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Claire Hurley</b>
<b>DCDP345611609</b>	DCDP345611609
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission objects to further development in Broomfield potentially adding 600 additional cars to an already congested road network in the area.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands at Broomfield have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Claire Maher</b>
<b>DCDP345663241</b>	DCDP345663241
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of further lands for residential development at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site; The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Impact; The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</li> <li>- Safety Risks; The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>- Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk; The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2) Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads; The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</li> <li>- Social Infrastructure; The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) Existing issues. The submission raises concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stormwater attenuation tank on main green. The ground on the main green subsided in September 2020 due to the collapse of the attenuation tank. No works were carried out on the tank for over nine months, meaning that the green area was off limits and a potential safety hazard. Castle Rock Homes cited COVID as a reason for not carrying out the essential works required on the attenuation tank, though they continued building new houses during Level 5 restrictions.</li> <li>- Lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping. Castle Rock Homes has ceased cutting the grass or maintaining any of the gardens in the estate</li> </ul>

	<p>since mid-2020. The residents have had no option but to do some basic gardening and cutting of lawn despite the estate still being Castle Rock Homes's responsibility. In addition, some of the areas have not been landscaped at all.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of Safety Fences; Several of the retaining walls have no safety barriers despite the significant dangers to residents, and especially children.</li> <li>- Lack of Screening for Privacy. Several gardens are overlooked by roads, but no adequate screening has been provided for privacy.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands at Broomfield have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr. Michael Hegarty &amp; Cllr. Mary Linehan Foley</b>
<b>DCDP346148733</b>	DCDP346148733
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the development boundary for Killeagh be amended as proposed and agreed at the East Cork Municipal District Meeting.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	It is considered appropriate to amend the development boundary of Killeagh to the south west of the settlement to exclude a small area of land.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	No objection to the proposed amendment.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.9.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Concerned Resident of Blossom/Wheatley Hills Broomfield Village Estate</b>
<b>DCDP344804901</b>	DCDP344804901
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to the proposed zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield being developed until the following issues have been resolved satisfactorily.</p> <p>1) Sink holes and subsidence have been artificially created and accelerated due to poor installation of storm water tanks on the main green at Broomfield Village. Although new storm tanks have been put in recently to address this problem a new sink hole has since appeared. Concerns that further development in the area and the removal of the hill at MD-R-27 will cause more erosion and surface water downpour to the green.</p> <p>2) Traffic congestion – the Broomfield Court Road is heavily used by both residents and non-residents. At peak times long queues of vehicles back up</p>

	<p>from Avoncore Place to the R626 intersection to Broomfield Road. Concerns are raised that further residential development in the area will exacerbate traffic congestion.</p> <p>The submission requests that these concerns are taken into consideration prior to any further development taking place in the Broomfield area.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands at Broomfield have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Co-Operative Marts</b>
<b>DCDP346072315</b>	DCDP346072315
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that car parking requirements be completely relaxed in town centre locations.</p> <p>The submission also requests a change in a portion of the MD-T-06 zoning [i.e. the removal of the north western portion] or suggests a slight change in the wording of the zoning to:  ‘To provide for the development of non retail town centre uses including office based employment, leisure, civic or healthcare uses and where appropriate residential development. This area is not suited to comparison shopping.’</p> <p>It is requested that [with particular reference to Knockgriffin and the residential nature of the area] that the zoning for this site be amended to allow a solely residential development to occur that is in keeping with the existing residential nature of this part of the site.</p> <p>The submission refers to vacant commercial units in the adjoining retail park and states that a commercial element would be both unviable and unsuitable given the residential nature of the adjoining land uses. The reference to bulky goods needs to be removed or the site will remain vacant.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do car parking requirements need to be completely relaxed in town centre locations?</li> <li>2. Should a portion of the MD-T-06 lands be rezoned to allow residential development?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Council’s car parking policy seeks to ensure adequate and appropriate provision of car parking in town centres. It also seeks to balance car parking provision so that it aligns with and supports</li> </ol>

	<p>compact growth and sustainable transport. Current Car Parking Standards are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 12 of this Plan.</p> <p>2. It is considered that there is a need to retain Town Centre land uses in Midleton however residential uses at first floor level or above will be acceptable on this site as part of a mixed-use scheme.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.26.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Co-Operative Marts</b>
<b>DCDP346207919</b>	DCDP346207919
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes the rezoning of lands at Knockgriffin Midleton from High Technology Campus to Residential given the proximity of the site to the Water-Rock UAE and its location within the Development Boundary of Midleton Town. The proposed site forms part of the MD-HT-01 zoning and is 15.27 hectares in area.</p> <p>The submission states that there are 3 High Technology Campus Designations proposed in the draft plan and this is considered unrealistic. Given the extreme housing shortage and walkability to rail infrastructure the submission strongly recommends these lands be given a residential zoning.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands at Knockgriffin in Midleton which presently form part of MD-HT-01 be zoned for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>There is already a very strong supply of lands for residential use in Midleton. Lands are also needed for employment use and these lands abut the rail line close to a proposed new train station. The current zoning is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The Planning Authority intend to complete a review of the employment land supply across the county and the HT-01 zoning can be further considered as part of that process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork East City Leisure Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346028404</b>	DCDP346028404
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that lands Dwyers Road, Midleton maintain the town centre zoning on the Midleton Enterprise site as per the Midleton Town Development Plan 2013. The site has an area of c. 2.2 hectares and is part of the Midleton Enterprise park. The site presently consists of an old industrial type single level structure of circa 10,000sq.m GFA. The premises is currently sub-divided into a range of retail and commercial uses to include convenience retail, retail services and comparison uses.</p> <p>The proposed zoning on the site in the Draft CDP 2021 is MD-X-02 which proposes 'to support the redevelopment of this site for a dense mix of uses to include business/office based employment and residential with new public realm space to the waterfront which should include a set back from the River and strong pedestrian connectivity to the north and east of the</p>

	<p>town centre.'</p> <p>The submission states that the submitter is currently in negotiation with a national retail multiple who is seeking to develop a large-scale retail format for convenience and comparison retail. Their requirement is for a site of approximately 2 hectares that can accommodate a single level retail offering consisting of c. 2,400 sqm (net) of convenience retail floor space and c.2,400 sq.m (net of comparison retail floor space). The submission states that the subject site is an ideal location for this retail format as the site is flat and of sufficient size to accommodate the development requirements.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	That lands at Dwyers Road, Midleton, containing the Midleton Enterprise Park, maintain the town centre zoning as per the Midleton Town Development Plan 2013.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to amend to zoning objective of the site to include retail.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.21
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>D&amp;B Waterman Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346247714</b>	DCDP346247714
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that 2.35 ha of land is included within the development boundary of Ballycotton. The lands are part of the Rural Housing Policy Area 'Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence'. The submission also proposes that there is an objective included in the Development Plan to provide (i) a link/ distributor road through Ballycotton which includes for pedestrian and cycle infrastructure to enhance connectivity with the village centre and (ii) upgrades to the Main Street/ Barrack Junction and surrounding area to improve road safety.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Ballycotton for development?</li> <li>2. Should provision be made for a link/distributor road through Ballycotton to improve connectivity in the village?</li> <li>3. Should provision be made for upgrades to the Main Street/Barrack Junction and surrounding area to improve road safety?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that there is a sufficient amount of land located within the existing development boundary to cater for the proposed level of population growth in the village over the lifetime of this plan. No change proposed to the boundary.</li> <li>2. The Planning Authority has no plans to provide a link road as detailed in the submission in Ballycotton. It is envisaged that any such improvements, if required, would be developer led and funded.</li> <li>3. The Planning Authority has no plans to improve the road infrastructure in Ballycotton. It is envisaged that any such improvements, if required, would be developer led and funded.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>D&amp;B Waterman Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346250137</b>	DCDP346250137

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is a duplicate of Submission DCDP346247714.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	This submission is a duplicate of Submission DCDP346247714.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This submission is a duplicate of Submission DCDP346247714.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Damien Clifford</b>
<b>DCDP346281141</b>	DCDP346281141
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Castlemartyr be zoned for residential development. The two parcels of land are contiguous to the village development boundary and lie east of CM-R-02 and CM-R-01. Lands are currently part of the Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for further residential lands to be zoned in Castlemartyr?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is a sufficient amount of land zoned for residential development in Castlemartyr to cater for the proposed population increase to 2028.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dan &amp; Claire O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP344762027</b>	DCDP344762027
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands to the north of Water-Rock UEA are included within the development boundary of Midleton for future residential use, either Residential Reserve (RR) or Agriculture (AG). The lands, which are contiguous to the development boundary of Midleton, are approx 48.56 ha in area and comprise the former 18-hole Water Rock Golf Course. The lands presently form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to the north at Water-Rock to zone additional lands for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not proposed to extend the development boundary of Midleton to the north to include additional lands for residential reserve use or agriculture. Sufficient land is available closer to the town to cater for the proposed population increase to 2028. The suitability of these lands for development is a matter for the future reviews of the plan and it would be premature of consider it at this stage. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Daniel O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP346206535</b>	DCDP346206535
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons;  Unsuitable Site: This zoning is not an example of sustainable development. The site is one of the most elevated and exposed sites in Midleton and



	<p>provides a green scape over the town which would be completely lost.</p> <p>Lack of Infrastructure: The road network is already at capacity. In addition, there are no schools, shops or parks to support this area at present.</p> <p>Loss of Green Infrastructure and Amenity: The road provides a much-needed country walk with extensive hedgerows and mature trees. Rezoning and developing of this land will not protect the skyline and will require extensive removal of trees and hedgerows in contradiction with the Draft County Development Plan Objective GI 14-9 Parts d and e.</p> <p>Water-Rock: Extensive land is already zoned for residential, schools and parks and connectivity to the town in the Waterrock area. This land should be developed before other lands are re zoned from green infrastructure.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>David &amp; Liza McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP346300983</b>	DCDP346300983
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to lands at at Youghal Mudlands / Foxhole, Youghal, Co. Cork. The submission objects to any inappropriate uses, including the treatment of hazardous / non-hazardous waste. The submission has no objection to manufacturing, repairs, warehousing etc.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	That lands at Mudlands/Foxhole in Youghal not be used for inappropriate uses including the treatment of hazardous/non hazardous waste.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a matter for the development management process. Appropriate land uses relating to specific zonings are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 18 of the Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>David Walsh</b>
<b>DCDP340624646</b>	DCDP340624646
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following points in relation to any possible future development to the north of Hollyridge Estate on MD-R-25, MD-R-26 and MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midelton.</p> <p>1. That Hollyridge Estate remains as a cul-de-sac.</p>

	<p>2. That there would be no access road through the Hollyridge estate to any future development to the north.</p> <p>3. That there would be no pedestrian / cycle access to any future development through Hollyridge estate.</p> <p>4. That all vehicular traffic and cycle and pedestrian traffic would be routed via the road locally known as Broomfield Hill by the council waterworks.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Submission requests that the Hollyridge Estate at Broomfield remain as a cul de sac and not be opened up as an access road to any future residential development at Broomfield.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There are no proposals to open up any road in Hollyridge Estate as an access road for lands to the north. This plan is making no provision to open up access.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dawn Meats Group</b>
<b>DCDP346229225</b>	DCDP346229225
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands which form part the Water-Rock UEA and which are have an area of approximately 14ha. The lands are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure (MD-GR-10), Community Use with provision for a primary school (MD-C-01) and residential use with some of the lands forming part of MD-R-16 and MD-R-10 and MD-R-07 in the Draft CDP 2021.</p> <p>The stated purpose of the submission is to firstly provide a locational context to the submission by identifying the strategic positioning of the subject lands within the Water Rock area and to secondly outline potential issues contained within the Draft Plan that may hinder the growth of the area. The submission focuses on areas of ambiguity pertaining to land use and development objectives.</p> <p>This submission also details the need to ensure that the forthcoming Plan includes relevant development objectives to promote and encourage age-friendly development within the County over the next plan period.</p> <p>This submission sets out how, the inclusion of policy objectives to support and promote age-friendly development can contribute to facilitating the creation of sustainable residential communities supported by the access to amenities, services and facilities for our ageing population. The submission states that it is imperative that residentially zoned lands permit age-friendly accommodation including independent living, assisted living and residential nursing homes and that such uses are not unduly restricted by onerous zoning objectives.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for the CDP to include relevant development objectives to promote and encourage age-friendly development within the County?

	Should residential zoned lands (specifically at Water-Rock) permit age friendly accommodation which would include independent living, assisted living and residential nursing homes?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Policies and objectives relating to the Provision for Older Persons are set out in Chapter 4 Housing and Chapter 6 Social and Community in Volume 1 of this plan.</p> <p>Nursing Homes and housing for older people can be permitted on lands zoned for residential development. Cork County Council will continue to support the provision of accommodation for older persons and encourage new models of accommodation for older persons in an effort to enhance quality of care. It is not intended to change land use zoning objectives in the Water-rock UEA.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>DF Glandore Developments Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345943249</b>	DCDP345943249
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands which are located at the eastern side of Shanagarry/Garryvoe in the townland of Garryvoe Lower. The lands are located inside the development boundary of the village. The site comprises a small housing estate and the remainder of the lands are undeveloped and together with the existing residential scheme form part of a development permitted under application reg. ref: 06/7273 for which a total of 48 units were permitted. A total of 25 no. of these units were completed under this permission and are now occupied in permanent residential use.</p> <p>The submission states that it is the intention to complete the originally permitted estate while also developing the remainder of the site in tandem with the aim of securing permissions for between 40no. to 60no. new housing units.</p> <p>The submission suggests that it should not be the intention of the County Development Plan to unduly constrain potential development within existing settlements such as Garryvoe. It is submitted that the final County Development Plan should not seek to be overly prescriptive in detailing maximum development targets for individual settlements. On this basis, the submission requests that the proposed scale of development figure of 70 no units for Shanagarry/Garryvoe is reviewed and either modified or removed to better reflect the clear potential for residential development within the settlement and the possibility for infrastructure solutions to facilitate further development over the period 2022-2028.</p> <p>The submission also requests that the western extent of the GC-01 zoning objective is reviewed in the preparation of the final plan and a zoning boundary properly reflecting the extent of both the wetland and the proposed site is established.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Requests that consideration be given to modifying or removing the maximum development figure of 70 units in Shanagarry/Garryvoe to better reflect the potential for residential development within the settlement.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	In keeping with the many changes to government policy in recent years, the housing allocation for Cork County for the period to 2028 is significantly less than that outlined in current plans. This has necessitated a review of growth levels across the settlement network in line with national policy on compact employment led growth, regeneration of towns and villages etc. The scale of growth allocated to Shanagarry/Garryvoe is considered appropriate in this context and in keeping with its position as a village in the settlement network. As part of the Active Land Management process, development in villages will be monitored over the life of the plan and consideration can be given to reallocation of growth as appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dr Tom ODonovan</b>
<b>DCDP346273253</b>	DCDP346273253
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission proposes that 3.56ha lands at Knockaverry in Youghal be zoned for mixed use residential and tourism development including hotel use. The lands are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure Conservation (YL-GC-16) in the Draft Plan and for residential development (YL-R-15) in the Youghal Town Plan 2009-2015.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands at Knockaverry in Youghal be zoned for mixed use residential and tourism development including hotel use? The lands are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure in the Draft Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are very steep, elevated, and visually exposed and have very poor road access. They are not considered suitable for development and should be retained as open space to protect the visual amenities of the town. The land also contains habitats of local biodiversity value. Ample other lands are available to cater for the proposed population increase up to 2028. No change proposed
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>East Cork Educate Together Secondary School (ECETSS)</b>
<b>DCDP341930800</b>	DCDP341930800
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission outlines the urgent requirement for a Secondary School in East Cork. The submission refers to census data which is included in a report carried out by the East Cork Educate Together Secondary School group. The report shows that since 2006 East Cork has experienced significant population growth far greater than the national average. It highlights the latest figures on enrolment from the Department of Education which show that there has been a 27.7% rise between 2011 and 2019 in National Schools.</p> <p>The submission states that figures for enrolment at Post Primary level already show a 30.7% increase versus a national average of 10.8% for the same period. Census Data shows population structure of 0-18 years olds in East Cork differs from Cork County and National Level with a greater proportion of 0-8 year olds in East Cork. This indicates that there will be a surge in post primary enrolment.</p>

	<p>The submission states that all national schools and post primary schools in East Cork are in the process of expanding or have reached capacity with data shows demand is already outweighing places at 2nd level.</p> <p>The submission also raises concerns that further residential development in East Cork will result in a population increase in the area. It states that plans for schools in the Water-Rock development will only cater for this specific development and that an additional new zoning is required to accommodate a secondary school campus adjacent to the Midleton Educate Together NS. This would benefit potential traffic congestion as careful scheduling of start/finishing times can be organised.</p> <p>The submission includes a link to the East Cork Educate Together Secondary School Site Report at; <a href="http://ecetss.ie/east-cork-secondary-school-crisis/">http://ecetss.ie/east-cork-secondary-school-crisis/</a>.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The requirement for a new secondary school in Midleton, in addition to the designated secondary school site at Water-Rock.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The Department of Education in their submission refer to the East Cork Secondary School Crisis Report which is referenced in Volume 1 Chapter 6 of the Draft Plan. The Department state that the report which was issued by a local interest group details historic information concerning East Cork population trends. In contrast, this Department's projection of future school place requirements is predicated on detailed analysis of current and future demographic trends.</p> <p>The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities in their submission based on the Core Strategy population figures in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>In relation to the provision of school places in East Cork and specifically Midleton and Youghal the Department does not identify the need for a new secondary school site in East Cork.</p> <p>In the settlement of Midleton, there are five mainstream primary schools and four post-primary schools. According to the Department of Education the level of population expansion envisaged in Midleton may generate a requirement for new schools over the medium to long term, subject to the timing and location of the growth. At a maximum, the Department estimates that up to two new primary schools could be required and up to one post-primary school. The Department states that the East Cork MD Draft plan meets these projected potential requirements. The Department also state that in order to meet post-primary requirements in the settlement in the short to medium term, increased capacity is being provided at two of the post-primary schools (St. Mary High School and St. Colman's Community College).</p> <p>In the settlement of Youghal itself, there are three mainstream primary schools and one post-primary school. At primary level, there is no anticipated requirement for additional capacity in Youghal. At post-primary</p>

	level, a relatively modest increase in enrolment is projected which could be accommodated by expansion of existing facilities.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Edgefield Property Investments Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345927153</b>	DCDP345927153
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission from Edgefield Property Investments Limited, relates to lands within the Water-Rock Urban Expansion Area (WRUEA) in Midleton, zoned as MD-R-09 and MD-R-22 in the Draft Plan. Submission is concerned about the change in the phasing of the zoned areas, indicating that under the current 2017 LAP the lands is included within the first phase of delivery for Water-Rock, while in the Draft Plan they are in phases two and three. Submission requests that the Draft Plan should continue to support the early delivery of these lands as part of the WRUEA, noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the sites are strategically located within the WRUEA, with a direct connection to the East Cork Parkway (N25) via Castle Rock Avenue. The sites are also strategically located close to the Cork-Midleton Rail Line and are within the environs of Midleton Rail Station;</li> <li>• the sites are bisected by a newly built access road with high quality with pedestrian access, and street lighting, facilitating delivery of development on the site .</li> <li>• site can be developed with the adjoining open space giving a comprehensive development with strategic access links; and</li> <li>• earlier phasing of these sites would help enable development of other surroundings sites in terms of the logistics of construction.</li> <li>• The lands are in single ownership.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should MD-R-09 and MD-R-22 be in Water-Rock UEA be included in the earlier phases of development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The phasing arrangements for Water-Rock UEA are designed to be flexible, depending on the delivery of the relevant supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council have identified three bundles of core, on site infrastructure, including access roads, water services, and particular areas of open space, that they intend to deliver in order to facilitate the independent development of individual parcels of zoned lands.</p> <p>The Councils core on site infrastructure programme are outlined in Table 4.3.5 will regulate the timing of the commencement of development on particular parcels of zoned land.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>EI-H2</b>
<b>DCDP345738391</b>	DCDP345738391
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission is made in relation to lands in Whitegate and Aghada. The site is located in Lower Aghada and is approximately 1.6ha in area.

	<p>The proposal for the site is to develop a 50-megawatt (min) electrolysis plant which would result in the reduction of 63,000 tons of carbon emissions annually. The proposed hydrogen electrolysis plant will convert renewable energy and freshwater into gaseous hydrogen and gaseous oxygen which will be stored on site. The proposed site (currently a boat yard site) was identified by EI-H2 as having Demand on Doorstep (DoD) with Irving Oil Refinery, 2 no. power plants and a number of local heavy industries and a Gas Networks Irelands (GNI) connection point all within 4km.</p> <p>The existing boatyard site is c 1.6 ha in area comprising an outdoor boat storage area and indoor repair areas. The current zoning objective for the lands in the 2017 MD LAP is 'Existing Built Up Area' which would facilitate the proposed use. The zoning for the site was amended in the Draft CDP plan 2021 and the site is proposed for Open Space (WG-GC-04). The objective of this site is to 'retain open space where existing land uses will remain largely unchanged. The site is within Cork Harbour Special Protection Area and is not suitable for development. The area makes a significant contribution to the attractiveness of longer distance views from the Cobh area and provides important visual and physical separation between the village of Aghada and Industrial areas to the west'.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the zoning for the site is changed to 'Industry' as the proposed energy related use will be more consistent with the vision for Whitegate and Aghada which sets to 'promote its role as a location for the storage and processing of strategic energy resources, consolidating its industrial and harbour related roles within this sensitive coastal setting'. The submission states that it is envisaged that the proposed plant will be of a scale to the existing shed on the site, if not lower and akin to a low level manufacturing facility.</p> <p>The submission requests that the establishment of a new industrial zoning on this site, similar to the existing zoning WG-I-05 which supports industrial/energy generation uses while safeguarding the views and settings of Cork Harbour would be the most appropriate zoning on this site to facilitate the proposed development.</p> <p>The submission therefore proposes the following objective on the site; 'Provision for renewable energy generation/storage uses. Any new development on the site shall pay special attention both to the design and siting of any large structures or buildings so as to minimise the visual impact of development, including on longer distance views from the Cobh area, and shall include provision for maintenance of structural landscaping to the northern and southern site boundaries. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and sufficient storm water attenuation will be required for any development which may be permitted in this area.'</p> <p>The submission states that the production of green hydrogen is recognised in the Draft CDP as a key element in the decarbonising of our economy and that the proposed zoning objective will support the development of an</p>
--	---



	innovative renewable hydrogen electrolysis facility in the area.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it considered appropriate to zone lands for 'Industry' at Whitegate and Aghada to allow for the development of an electrolysis plant?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Due to the existing boat yard use on this site it is considered appropriate to zone the proposed lands for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and map amendment required. See Amendment No. 4.3.8.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>EMR Projects Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346231717</b>	DCDP346231717
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands which form part the Water-Rock UEA and which are have an area of approximately 6.8 ha. The lands are presently zoned for high density residential development (MD-R-07 and MD-R-08). Some of the lands also form part of MD-HT-02 (High Technology Campus Development) and there is also a zoning objective to provide a Rail Stop (MD-U-05) on the Midleton to Cork Railway line.</p> <p>The stated purpose of the submission is to firstly provide a locational context to the submission by identifying the strategic positioning of the subject lands within the Water Rock area and to secondly outline potential issues contained within the Draft Plan that may hinder the growth of the area. The submission focuses on areas of ambiguity pertaining to land use and development objectives.</p> <p>This submission also details the need to ensure that the forthcoming Plan includes relevant development objectives to promote and encourage age-friendly development within the County over the next plan period.</p> <p>This submission sets out how, the inclusion of policy objectives to support and promote age-friendly development can contribute to facilitating the creation of sustainable residential communities supported by the access to amenities, services and facilities for our ageing population.</p> <p>The submission states that it is imperative that residentially zoned lands permit age-friendly accommodation including independent living, assisted living and residential nursing homes and that such uses are not unduly restricted by onerous zoning objectives.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>Is there a need for the CDP to include relevant development objectives to promote and encourage age-friendly development within the County?</p> <p>Should residential zoned lands (specifically at Water-Rock) permit age friendly accommodation which would include independent living, assisted living and residential nursing homes?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Policies and objectives relating to the Provision for Older Persons are set out in Chapter 4 Housing and Chapter 6 Social and Community in Volume 1 of this plan.

	Nursing Homes and housing for older people can be permitted on lands zoned for residential development. Cork County Council will continue to support the provision of accommodation for older persons and encourage new models of accommodation for older persons in an effort to enhance quality of care. It is not intended to change land use zoning objectives in the Water-rock UEA.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP332408658</b>	DCDP332408658
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that residential zoning objective CM-R-02 in Castlemartyr should not include any proposals to provide connectivity through the adjoining Maples Gort an Óir housing development. The submission states that Gort an Óir is a finished housing estate and any proposed future entrance to CM-R-02 should come from the Killeagh Road.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	That any proposals to develop CM-R-02 in Castlemartyr would not include connectivity through the adjoining Maples Gort an Oir housing development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	CM-R-02 Residential Zoning to be taken off due to revised CS figures. Site will remain within the development boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.6.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP332410813</b>	DCDP332410813
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission outlines that a pedestrian crossing, lights & traffic calming / traffic slowing measures are essential at the eastern end of Castlemartyr village prior to any further proposed developments.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for a pedestrian crossing, lights and traffic calming measures at the eastern end of Castlemartyr village?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The provision of pedestrian crossings is beyond the scope of the County Development Plan and should be addressed locally through the MD office.  This section of the N25 was recently upgraded by the National Roads Design Office / TII.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328484665</b>	DCDP328484665
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that Castlemartyr does not have a Community Hall, Garda Station or Sports Facilities in the village as stated in the Draft County Development Plan.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Text correction in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. The plan will be updated to reflect issues raised in the submission.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328485767</b>	DCDP328485767
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that the lack of parking in Castlemartyr village is a major issue.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a lack of parking in Castlemartyr village?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The Council's car parking policy seeks to ensure adequate and appropriate provision of car parking in town centres. It also seeks to balance car parking provision so that it aligns with and supports compact growth and sustainable transport. Current Car Parking Standards are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 12 of this Plan.</p> <p>The number of on street parking car parking spaces in Castlemartyr is considered adequate to meet existing demand. Any future development will be required to provide parking in accordance with the County Development Plan.</p> <p>Note that Cork County Council is advancing a footpath project along the Ladysbridge Road between the traffic lights and the hotel. Ancillary to these works will be the formalising of parking on what is currently the hard shoulder.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Proposed text amendment. 4.3.6.6
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328486244</b>	DCDP328486244
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that consideration be given to zoning land for community and amenity facilities in the village of Castlemartyr as it states that there are none there at present. The submission also refers to the need for additional childcare facilities in the village as existing childcare facilities are currently at capacity.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for the zoning of land for community and amenity facilities in Castlemartyr?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>There is a proposal to include a new green infrastructure site which is part of CM-T-01 (south eastern corner).</p> <p>Childcare facilities may be located on land zoned for residential development. See Volume 1, Chapter 18 in this plan 'Appropriate Uses in Residential Areas'.</p> <p>In addition objective SC 6-4 'Childcare Facilities' in Chapter 6 of this plan seeks the provision of childcare facilities concurrent with development and there is adequate scope within the development boundary of Castlemartyr village and on zoned lands, to cater for such facilities.</p> <p>The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. See Paragraph 14.5.5.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.6.3
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328486569</b>	DCDP328486569
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that it is difficult for children to secure secondary school places in East Cork and requests that consideration be given to Castlemartyr as a potential location for a secondary school in East Cork.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Submission highlights the need for a secondary school in East Cork and the consideration of Castlemartyr as a potential location for a new secondary school
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Department of Education, in its submission to the Draft Plan, does not identify a requirement for a secondary school in Castlemartyr.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328487060</b>	DCDP328487060
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that traffic and speed are a major concern for residents in Castlemartyr. It states that there is an urgent requirement for additional pedestrian crossings particularly to the east of the village and speed reducing measures throughout the village.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Submission highlights the need for additional pedestrian crossings in Castlemartyr, particularly to the east of the village.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The provision of pedestrian crossings is beyond the scope of the County Development Plan and should be addressed locally through the MD office. This section of the N25 was recently upgraded by the National Roads Design Office / TII. The provision of a bypass for Castlemartyr is an objective of the Development Plan. The provision of a bypass will significantly reduce traffic through Castlemartyr.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr &amp; Mogeely</b>
<b>DCDP328487436</b>	DCDP328487436
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission raises concerns regarding safety at the gates of Castlemartyr National School and at the entrance to Castlemanor Estate which it states is a major concern for all of the school community in the village. The submission refers to land known as the Pig Mart which is a central green area in the village and states that this land should be considered as the access to the national school. The use of this land would allow access to the school to be taken from the Ladysbridge road and would provide a safer access for children crossing the main N25 network at school times.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The requirement for a new entrance to Castlemartyr National School from the Ladysbridge road.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Access and egress to the existing Castlemartyr National School as currently permitted is a matter for the Board of Management and Department of Education.</p> <p>It is proposed to rezone Town Centre lands for Green Infrastructure to the west of the school. These lands may be able to provide an alternative access for the school from the Ladysbridge road in the future.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP343106067</b>	DCDP343106067
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that consideration be given to the inclusion of childcare facilities in the Ladysbridge area. The submission states that while there has been a large increase in the population of the area in recent years there has been no development of any childcare facilities to cater for childcare needs.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need for childcare facilities in Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Text will be included in the plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village including childcare and sports facilities.</p> <p>Objective SC 6-4 'Childcare Facilities' in Chapter 6 of this plan seeks the provision of childcare facilities concurrent with development and there is adequate scope within the development boundary of Ladysbridge to cater for such facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text amendment required. See Amendment No. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP345413239</b>	DCDP345413239
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that consideration be given to improving the footpaths in the village of Ladysbridge and providing safe pedestrian connectivity to Castlemartyr. The submission states that the current East Cork Draft Local Area Plan proposes no local improvements for Ladysbridge.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need for pedestrian connectivity from Ladysbridge to Castlemartyr.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Cork County Council has sought funding from the NTA to conduct a feasibility study to identify costings for the provision of a link footpath from Castlemartyr GAA grounds to Ladysbridge. The NTA has not approved funding at this time. Supportive text will be included in this Plan for the future provision of a pedestrian connectivity between Ladysbridge and Castlemartyr.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP345413828</b>	DCDP345413828
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that the village of Ladysbridge is in urgent need of childcare facilities, a primary school, greenspaces, cycle paths, connectivity

	to the Midleton to Youghal Greenway and surface improvements along the Long Acre Walk. The submission states that the village has a growing population and yet no local improvements have been included in the East Cork Draft Local Area Plan.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need for childcare facilities, a primary school, greenspaces, cycle paths and connectivity in Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Text will be included in the plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village including childcare and sports facilities.</p> <p>The 'Long Acre Walk' on the Ladysbridge to Garryvoe Road was developed and is maintained by a Community Group. The walk is to trail standards and is in a non-urban area. There is no proposal by Cork County Council (or funding) to take in charge and upgrade to a shared cycle / pedestrian footpath standard.</p> <p>The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify the need for a primary school in Ladysbridge.</p> <p>Objective SC 6-4 'Childcare Facilities' in Chapter 6 of this plan seeks the provision of childcare facilities concurrent with development and there is adequate scope within the development boundary of Ladysbridge to cater for such facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP345414363</b>	DCDP345414363
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that consideration be given to upgrading the derelict school in Ladysbridge to a remote working hub.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Could the derelict school in Ladysbridge be converted to a remote working hub?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This issue can be dealt with through the Development Management process.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP345415860</b>	DCDP345415860
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to a disabled car parking space which is located on the R632 Regional road junction at the bridge in Castlemartyr Village. The submission states that the car parking space is causing congestion while also being a safety concern for the driver exiting their car.</p> <p>The submission states that the location of the space also encourages parking alongside it adding to the congestion at the junction. The</p>

	submission requests that this space be moved to the other side of the road allowing more space for the car user and removing additional congestion on the left lane existing onto the N25. The submission also suggests that a pedestrian crossing light would ensure safe crossing for the car user.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to move the disabled car parking space at the Ladysbridge side of the R632 junction at Castlemartyr bridge to the other side of the road in order to alleviate traffic congestion at the junction and for the health and safety of the user of the space?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Cork County Council is advancing a footpath along the Ladysbridge Road between the traffic lights at the junction with the N25 and the Castlemartyr Resort hotel. Ancillary to these works will be the formalising of parking on what is currently the hard shoulder on the R632. The detailed design will consider the enhancement of disabled persons parking facilities at this location.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.6.7
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP343111188</b>	DCDP343111188
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to the villages of Mogeely, Castlemartyr & Ladysbridge. The submission states that these villages are subject to ever increasing volumes of traffic, congestion, and dangerous speeding. The residents find this very difficult particularly during the summer months when the volume of through traffic is very high and residents find it hard to get in and out of these villages.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Increasing volumes of traffic, congestion and speeding through the villages of Mogeely, Castlemartyr and Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The provision of a bypass of Castlemartyr is an objective of the County Development Plan. The provision of a bypass will reduce traffic through Castlmartyr and will also reduce traffic through Mogeely and Ladysbridge as the routes through these villages are currently being used by traffic as alternative routes to bypass Castlemartyr.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr, Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP344880246</b>	DCDP344880246
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to a disabled car parking space which is located on the R632 Regional road junction at the bridge in Castlemartyr Village.</p> <p>Firstly, the submission raises safety concerns as the space is located in an extremely dangerous position at a very busy junction making it difficult for a person with a disability trying to get in or out of their car.</p> <p>Secondly, the submission states that when approaching the junction from the Ladysbridge Road the car parking space is obstructing traffic and</p>



	<p>preventing motorists from being able to get into the left hand lane to access the N25 adding further to the backlog of traffic. The congestion is also obstructing any vehicle parked in the space.</p> <p>The submission states that traffic is at a standstill here during peak periods particularly during summer months when traffic has been backed up beyond the Castlemartyr GAA pitch. The submission requests that this disabled parking space be relocated within the village to a more suitably accessible and less hazardous position for both the disabled individual and motorists using the R632.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to move the disabled car parking space at the Ladysbridge side of the R632 junction at Castlemartyr bridge to a more suitably accessible and less hazardous position in order to alleviate traffic congestion at the junction and for the health and safety of the user of the space?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Cork County Council is advancing a footpath along the Ladysbridge Road between the traffic lights at the junction with the N25 and the Castlemartyr Resort hotel. Ancillary to these works will be the formalising of parking on what is currently the hard shoulder on the R632. The detailed design will consider the enhancement of disabled persons parking facilities at this location.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.6.7
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Families of Castlemartyr, Mogeely &amp; Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP343108567</b>	DCDP343108567
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following issues which relate to the village of Ladysbridge;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The village is lacking in basic amenities.</li> <li>2) The village is completely cut off from any neighbouring areas for pedestrians.</li> <li>3) There are no public transport services available.</li> </ol> <p>The submission states that the lack of any amenities or services in the village means that only private transport will enable children to attend schools, preschools &amp; creches. The submission requests that consideration is given to these issues.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Lack of amenities, connectivity, and public transport services in Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Text will be included in the plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village including childcare and sports facilities.</p> <p>Cork County Council has sought funding from the NTA to conduct a feasibility study to identify costings for the provision of a link footpath from Castlemartyr GAA grounds to Ladysbridge. The NTA has not approved funding at this time. Supportive text will be included in this Plan for the future provision of a pedestrian connectivity between Ladysbridge and Castlemartyr.</p>

	<p>The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify the need for a primary school in Ladysbridge.</p> <p>Objective SC 6-4 'Childcare Facilities' in Chapter 6 of this plan seeks the provision of childcare facilities concurrent with development and there is adequate scope within the development boundary of Ladysbridge to cater for such facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fitzgerald Homes</b>
<b>DCDP344066779</b>	DCDP344066779
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to a site in Youghal, County Cork which is presently zoned as YL-AG-02 in the Draft CDP 2021.</p> <p>The submission states that the Draft Plan currently shows YL-AG-02 as a single field zoned in its entirety as agriculture however, YL-AG-02 is owned by different parties and Fitzgerald Homes are the owner of approximately 3.4 Hectares.</p> <p>This site is currently zoned for residential development within the adopted Youghal Town Development Pan 2009-2015 and Fitzgerald homes intend on developing this site to further contribute to housing delivery in Youghal.</p> <p>The submission requests that the site retains its residential zoning objective in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. The submission also requests that the council update the boundary line for YL-AG-02 to match the boundary lines of the existing site and the agricultural fields to the west (i.e. reduce the extent of YL-AG-02 and site within the residential zoning).</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to zone additional or alternative lands for residential development in Youghal? The land to the north of the town is presently zoned for residential development in the Town Plan and is zoned for Agriculture in the Draft Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands will be included for residential development in the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Proposed text and map amendment. 4.3.4.5
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Frances Kingston</b>
<b>DCDP345862643</b>	DCDP345862643
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to lands to the south east of the development boundary of Ballinacurra in Midleton. The site is 2.65 ha in area and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that allowing Ballinacurra to expand on the subject site, for educational and residential uses would consolidate and support the existing population of Ballinacurra and would provide for the sustainable growth of the settlement.

	The submission refers to the need for a primary school which it states should not be postponed any further and provision should be made within the village core, ideally on the subject site which was subject of a previous application and which was acceptable pending the resolution of infrastructural issues. The submission outlines that the upgrade of the R630 to a national road and improvements of cycle and pedestrian connectivity will address the majority of these deficiencies.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to zone additional lands in Ballinacurra for residential and education purposes i.e. a primary school?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Provision has been made in Ballinacurra to facilitate a primary school on residential zoned lands which are less peripheral than the proposed site. It is considered that there is adequate scope on lands in Midleton to provide for a primary school if required in the future.</p> <p>In the settlement of Midleton, there are five mainstream primary schools and four post-primary schools.</p> <p>According to the Department of Education the level of population expansion envisaged in Midleton may generate a requirement for new schools over the medium to long term, subject to the timing and location of the growth. At a maximum, the Department estimates that up to two new primary schools could be required and up to one post-primary school. The Department states that the East Cork MD Draft plan meets these projected potential requirements.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ger and Kathryn Fitzgerald</b>
<b>DCDP346202400</b>	DCDP346202400
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands on the north side of the R907/ Youghal Road, Midleton be zoned for Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses in the Cork County Development Plan 2022. The lands which are 0.39 ha site are proposed for Green Infrastructure (GA-05) in the Draft Plan.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands on the Youghal Road, Midleton which presently form part of MD-GA-05 be included in the CDP as Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses to allow for a small infill residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are in an area at risk of flooding and are accordingly zoned for green infrastructure. Residential development is inappropriate in areas at risk of flooding. No change proposed
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Geraldine Kidd</b>
<b>DCDP346211656</b>	DCDP346211656
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests a change of use for four holiday cottages at Barnabrow to permanent residential dwellings.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Change of Use.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is an issue for the Development Management Process.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>GMC Construction Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP343015334</b>	DCDP343015334
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that Mogeely be upgraded to a Key Village status. The submission states that there is sufficient capacity in the new waste water treatments plant &amp; mains water to accommodate up to 250 houses in the village over the next 8 years on lands inside the development boundary.</p> <p>The submission specifically refers to 7.6 ha of land on the eastern side of the village on which development is ongoing. The site adjoins the new Midleton to Youghal greenway and is connected to Castlemartyr by a public footpath.</p> <p>The submission states that there has been very little development in key villages close to Mogeely over the last 10 years due to various constraints and that Mogeely could be an alternate to serve the housing need of the wider area.</p> <p>The submission includes a detailed flood risk assessment which shows that the subject lands are fully within flood zone C which is free of any flooding issues. The submission recommends that the flood map for Mogeely be changed to reflect the findings of the flood risk assessment.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should Mogeely be upgraded to Key Village Status to accommodate up to 250 houses within the development boundary of the village over the next 8 years?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. This review was based on a number of issues including service provision, size of settlement and potential to deliver housing over the next Plan period to 2028 and led to the recommendation for the removal of the development boundary of most village nuclei, other locations and some smaller villages. This review does not support any change to the village status of Mogeely. Extensive lands within the boundary, and the public roads serving the village, are impacted by flood risk and there are some constraints to the drink water supply serving the village. The growth target for the village (48units) is considered appropriate.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Graham Curtin</b>
<b>DCDP343807485</b>	DCDP343807485
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to proposed zoning MD-R-27 in Midleton. It states that the site will be an eyesore due to the elevated nature of the land and will cause further congestion on an already overloaded road network around the town.

	The submission states the there is a need to focus on required infrastructure for the town and its existing residents before further expansion of the town takes place. The proposed increase in population will make commuting to and through the town very difficult which will drive people elsewhere.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands . See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Proposed text and map amendment. See amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Hugh and Geraldine McMahon</b>
<b>DCDP339374395</b>	DCDP339374395
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south. The submission states that the quarry is a source of noise pollution for nearby residents and if it encroaches any further towards the estate boundary it will create a more significant issue for the residents of Roselawn. The submission also mentions the nearby telecommunications mast which is also a source of constant noise for residents.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ian O'Loughlin / Kate O'Loughlin</b>
<b>DCDP346274685</b>	DCDP346274685
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons;</p> <p>1) Privacy &amp; Light: overlooking of property at Blossomhill due to the</p>

	<p>elevated nature of the site.</p> <p>2) Mental Wellness: The lack of light coupled with loss of equity will negatively impact our mental health and cause stress.</p> <p>3) Devaluation caused by overlooking of property and traffic congestion.</p> <p>4) Lack of amenities / Infrastructure: wastewater, roads, shops, green areas and recreational spaces.</p> <p>5) Strategic Misalignment: The proposal to re-zone MD-R-27 for residential housing is at odds with the wider strategic plans for development of sustainable housing in the area when there are already plans to develop the UEA at Water-Rock.</p> <p>6) Environment &amp; Sustainability: loss of trees and hedgerows, visual impact on landscape and loss of green space and walks.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Proposed text and map amendment. See proposed amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Imogeela Community Sports Hall CLG</b>
<b>DCDP346291828</b>	DCDP346291828
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to the parish of Imogeela which consists of the villages of Castlemartyr, Mogeely, Dungourney and Clonmult and the surrounding areas. The submission states that there is very limited community space within the parish of Imogeela. The Imogeela Community Sports Hall CLG was set up to provide the youth of the parish with a community sports facility and hold a long-term lease on a two-acre site in the centre of the village, adjacent to the Church, Greenway and soccer field. The goal is to provide an amenity area to the community, which may include all weather playing surfaces and indoor sports facilities (details to be decided after community consultation). This amenity area will substantially enhance the leisure and recreational assets available to the parish and will increase the attractiveness and competitiveness of the area. The proximity of the proposed facility to the greenway maximises the potential use of both. The new development will be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure assets of the area. The submission requests that objective GA-01 be amended to support the goals of the community in providing the Community Sports Hall for the parish of Imogeela.</p>

<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should objective GA-01 in Mogeely be amended to support the goals of the community in providing a Community Sports Hall for the parish of Imogeela?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to include an amendment to GA-01 in the plan to provide support to the provision of a Community Sports Hall on this site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.17.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ingram Homes Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346247683</b>	DCDP346247683
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission from Ingram Homes raised issues in relation to housing density, with particular reference to their lands within the Water-Rock UEA. Submission is concerned about the draft plan enshrining minimum densities in each level of density in the plan, in response to what it sees as a misconceived interpretation of SPPR 4 of the Building Height Guidelines and concern with adherence to current Government Policy. Submitter considers the approach illogical having regard to the need to retain the flexibility in density targets in the context of ensuring that housing developments are both affordable and viable, having regard to the unviability of apartment and duplex type developments, needed to delivery higher density type developments in excess of 35 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Submission notes that the Draft Plan introduces new minimum densities of 50dph in the case of high density (up from 35dph), a minimum of 30 dph for Medium A (up from 20 dph), and a minimum of 20 dph for Medium B (up from 12 dph.) It is further noted that table 4.1 provides for a minimum Medium A density of 35 units per hectare in key and large towns and this is creating confusion. Objective HOU-4-7 further requires that Medium A zoned lands must include a higher proportion of terraced units and/ or apartment type units. It is considered that this approach completely ignores the substantive concerns raised by the construction sector re viability, marking conditions and local circumstances. It is argued that the council's obligation with respect to the 2009 Density Guidelines is simply to consider and have regard to them, and not to slavishly follow them, and that there is no legal impediment to the Council setting a lower density, is that is considered appropriate in terms of ensuring an adequate level of housing provision in the context of market forces and local demand considerations. Submitter also indicates that legal advice obtained considers SPPR4 to be legally flawed and the approach to density contained in the draft Plan is therefore not sustainable practically or legally and will choke the supply of housing.</p> <p>With respect to Water- Rock, the submission is concerned that the approach to density, when rolled out concurrently across all developments within the WRUEA could lead to the delivery of a large number of terraced houses, apartments and duplex's that will saturate demand for these house types in the initial stages of the development, potentially collapsing the market as the demand for such typologies is limited. This will further impact on viability. A greater variety of house types including detached and semidetached needs to be delivered or developments will fail. Submission notes that developers in Water Rock have entered legal agreements with the Council based on different density parameters. Submission requests</p>



	that the density proposals for their lands be altered to accord with those set out in the Water – Rock Urban Design Framework Document to provide for Medium B density development, or to indicate that densities less than 30dph will be considered to support viability and a mix of house types , or that minimum densities of 35dph will not be required in all cases, and densities of less than 30dph will not be precluded.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should minimum densities be included in the Development Plan or should there be more flexibility in density targets in the context of ensuring that housing developments are both affordable and viable? In particular should density proposals in Water-Rock be altered to accord with those set out in the Water – Rock Urban Design Framework Document to provide for Medium B density development, or to indicate that densities less than 30dph will be considered to support viability and a mix of house types , or that minimum densities of 35dph will not be required in all cases, and densities of less than 30dph will not be precluded.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The issue of minimum densities has been clarified under Circular NRUP 02/2021. The Plan proposes to make some adjustment to the text in Chapter 4 of Volume One, paragraph 4.7.10 to address issues of conflict that have arisen since the publication. The approach to the Water-Rock set out in Draft Plan is considered the most appropriate density and deliverability model. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required for Chapter 4 of Volume One of the Plan. See Amendment No. 1.4.3.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Irish Distillers International Limited (IDIL)</b>
<b>DCDP345958722</b>	DCDP345958722
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands which are presently zoned as part of MD-GR-17 (Green Infrastructure Recreation) in the Draft CDP 2021. The lands which are in the ownership of IDIL (Midleton Distillery) are in a flood risk zone.</p> <p>The submission on behalf of IDIL states that they have developed ambitious plans for a major regeneration of their brand home and visitor experience at Midleton Distillery and it is proposed to carry out this development in 3 phases. Planning permission has already been granted for the first 2 phases of this proposed development (Planning Reference 20/4811 and 20/5582) relating to the conservation and restoration of existing warehouse buildings and their change of use to a temporary heritage centre while the existing JEM complex is being redeveloped. IDIL intend to apply for planning permission for the third phase of development relating to the short-term use for enabling works of the lands to the south (lands which are part of MD-GR-17).</p> <p>The proposed development will comprise: 'The development of lands to the south of the boundary wall, (which were purchased from Midleton Town Council in 2018) as a multi-functional hardstanding area, constructed of 3 permeable gravel. To facilitate the temporary relocation of the JEM it is proposed to develop this area as an amenity space for visitors and staff and provide for carparking'.</p>

	<p>The submission states that IDIL have engaged with the Midleton Flood Risk Scheme and submitted proposals to enable the use of the lands. The proposal will allow for the long-term development of these lands as an amenity area, in a planned-led and integrated manner based on a positive partnership between our client and Cork County Council.</p> <p>To facilitate the development of this site IDIL request that the 'Existing Mixed/General/business Industrial Uses' on their current site be extended to all of their lands at Townparks, Midleton, Co. Cork.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Requests that lands which are presently zoned as part of MD-GR-17 in the Draft CDP and in the ownership of Midleton Distillery be changed to 'Existing Mixed/General/Business to facilitate the development of this site at Townparks, Midleton, Co. Cork.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The proposed site is part of the existing town park / grounds of the historic Midleton Lodge and it is an objective of the plan to 'retain and improve the existing town park and encourage continued public use of this area'. In the Midleton Town Development Plan, 2013, this site is part of a larger site designated OS 5-Town Park. It is an objective "a) To protect, retain and improve the existing public park and encourage increased public use of this area and facilitate nature conservation."</p> <p>Notwithstanding the transfer of ownership of this site to Irish Distillers in order to enable them to improve security to the distillery boundary ( distillery buildings abut the boundary with the park) , it is considered that the proposed change in zoning of park lands to "existing mixed/ general business/ industrial use" in order to facilitate an expansion of distillery operations into the park site would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and the role of the park. Any works need on the site can be assessed within the parameters of the current zoning, which is designed to protect and improve the park.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Irish Distillers International Limited (IDIL)</b>
<b>DCDP345747082</b>	DCDP345747082

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>This submission relates to I-01 and I-02 in Midleton in the Draft CDP 2021. The lands are presently zoned MD-I-04 and MD-I-05 in the 2017 East Cork MD LAP. The lands are in the ownership of Irish Distillers International Ltd. (IDIL). The submission states that IDIL are currently considering the expansion of the Distillery into the MD-I-01 lands.</p> <p>The submission welcomes the development of the Northern Relief Road, however, requests that consideration be given to the rationalising of the route alignment in Park South. The submission states that the MD-I-01 lands are compromised from a policy perspective due to uncertainty regarding the route of the Northern Relief Road, with two potential alignments shown in the East Cork Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 which have been carried forward into the Draft Plan for the southern portion of the route.</p> <p>The submission states that the rationalising of the route would prevent it from stymying the future distillery expansion. By preventing the severance of the subject site it will be opening up the adjoining lands to the east and removing a constraint to the future development and expansion of Midleton Distillery.</p> <p>The submission also acknowledges that some of the IDIL lands are within Flood Zone A. They state that they have engaged with the on-going work of the Midleton Flood Relief Scheme in relation to these lands and hope to work in positive partnership with Cork County Council to ensure their appropriate development.</p>
<p><b>Principle Issues Raised</b></p>	<p>Requests that consideration be given to rationalising the Northern Relief road route alignment option in Park South, Midleton to prevent it from compromising the development of the MD-I-01 lands due to uncertainty regarding the route.</p> <p>Acknowledgement that some IDIL lands are within flood zone A and will work with Cork County Council to ensure the appropriate development of these lands.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<p>Completion of the Northern Relief road is an important strategic project for Midleton. The Draft Plan includes the following text at paragraph 3.3.81 of the Midleton section:</p> <p>“Phase 1 has been completed, however Phases 2 and 3 are dependent on the availability of finance. Two potential routes are shown on the Midleton zoning map for the southern portion of Phase 3 of the route, running to the east, and west, of MD-I-01. These lines are indicative. The critical requirement for this route is that it joins the Old Youghal Road (R907) at a point sufficiently west of the junction between the R907 and the N25, to avoid negative impacts on the operation of the N25. The Council will consider other route alignment options that satisfy this requirement, and otherwise comply with road design and safety standards”.</p> <p>No change to these route options is proposed pending the finalisation of the route selection process.</p>

	Acknowledgement of the Midleton Flood Relief Scheme is noted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>J Lynch</b>
<b>DCDP346301105</b>	DCDP346301105
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that the development boundary of Midleton be extended to the west to include additional lands for residential development. The lands are located to the south of the Midleton Railway line and to the south west of Midleton UEA. Presently the lands (11.85 ha) form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for the zoning of further residential lands in Midleton?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is already sufficient residential land available inside the development boundary of Midleton to accommodate the proposed population growth of the town up to 2028. Further lands are therefore required at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Corcoran</b>
<b>DCDP345916856</b>	DCDP345916856
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following concerns in relation to the development of MD-R-27 at Broomfield, Midleton.</p> <p>1) Lack of water services infrastructure and road infrastructure. The road network proposed to be upgraded under application 187236 does not extend to the main junction with the R626 and will result in significantly increased traffic through Avoncore Place which does not have adequate Pedestrian / Cycle facilities to accommodate the increased footfall to the train station or the town.</p> <p>2) Lack of formal public transport adding to car congestion.</p> <p>3) Zoning of land. Investment should be directed to the development of the Water Rock UEA which will provide 2460 residential units for the town. Broomfield has been developed without a town centre. If any further development is planned in this area it should be for the provision of a services and amenities and not additional houses which will exacerbate problems in the area.</p> <p>4) Housing Yield; densities in current ongoing development in the Broomfield area are lower than recommended in order to mitigate the negative impact on an elevated and prominent location. The loss of “elevated and prominent” Visual Amenity land within the metropolitan greenbelt visible from the entire town would be a poor trade for such low efficiency zoning given its aesthetic value.</p> <p>5) Visual Amenity; the proposed development would be in conflict with GI-8-1 of the 2014 Cork County Development Plan i.e. ‘Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt Areas requiring Special Protection’. The development would also be in conflict with objectives GI 14-16: ‘Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt Map’ and GI 14-9: ‘Landscape’ of the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and with paragraphs 14.10.1, 14.10.2 and 14.10.3. The submission states that the protection of the visual amenity land in the Metropolitan Green Belt and the protection of skylines</p>

	and ridgelines are stated goals of the existing and proposed development plan. In the context of the poor Unit/Ha return on recent granted developments in this area, the rezoning of this land seems both incongruous with stated Cork County Council Policy and an inefficient use of key amenity land.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Morrison</b>
<b>DCDP341633713</b>	DCDP341633713
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to the proposed zoning of MD-R-25, MD-R-26 and MD-R-27 in the Broomfield area of Midleton. The following points are raised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a) Traffic is already at a critical point as residents of the Mill Road cannot get into or out of the town centre in a reasonable time frame. A traffic impact assessment needs to be prepared before adding another 300 houses to the traffic at a main pinch point of the town. Speeding is also an issue and there are lot of children living in the area. The car park at Herlihys Supervalu already creates congestion for residents.</li> <li>b) The weekly farmers Market on a Saturday is too big for the area and should be moved to a bigger more accessible space. A lot of children attend the market and families and the volume of traffic is dangerous.</li> <li>c) It can take residents living on or around the Mill road approximately 25 minutes (from Tom Clarkes terrace) to get to the Cork Road in order to exit the town.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Any proposals should include good connectivity to the train station and town centre for pedestrian and cyclists.</li> <li>3. Water services are not yet in place to support this development. The new planned waste water system should be in place before planning is considered as part of any proposal.</li> <li>4. Public amenities are lacking. There is one public toilet in the town and a severe lack of sanitation services bins and street cleaning in the town. This needs to be improved.</li> </ol>

<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James O'Connor TD</b>
<b>DCDP345931460</b>	DCDP345931460
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to the educational needs of the East Cork area.</p> <p>The submission states that there is a demand for additional land for educational purposes in the East Cork area. The East Cork MD has since 2006 experienced significant population growth far beyond the national average. The 2016 population of 42,399 represents a growth of 25.3% in the East Cork MD since 2006 substantially higher than the state average of 12.3%.</p> <p>This increase in population has put pressure on services in the area, mainly post primary schools where there is an increasing demand for places. According to the latest DES figures for primary schools for 2019-20, there is a 26.7% increase in enrolments since 2011-12 far greater than the national average of 14.2.</p> <p>The EDs with the most significant population growth are in East Cork. There is a notable concentration of increased population between Midleton, Cobh, and Youghal. This significant population increase can be attributed to the construction of new housing developments over the past twenty years, and the proximity and accessibility to Cork City. Therefore, there will continue to be increased population growth in the area in the coming years.</p> <p>The submission states that serious consideration is required by Cork County Council in conjunction with the Department of Education about the rezoning of lands for educational purposes to meet the above population growth dynamics.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Highlights the need for additional land for educational purposes in the East Cork area particularly post-primary schools.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Department of Education in their submission refer to the East Cork Secondary School Crisis Report which is reference in Volume 1 Chapter 6 of the Draft Plan. The Department state that the report which was issued by a local interest group details historic information concerning East Cork population trends. In contrast, this Department's projection of future

	<p>school place requirements is predicated on detailed analysis of current and future demographic trends.</p> <p>The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities in their submission based on the Core Strategy population figures in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>In relation to the provision of school places in East Cork and specifically Midleton and Youghal the Department do not identify the need for a new secondary school site in East Cork.</p> <p>In the settlement of Midleton, there are five mainstream primary schools and four post-primary schools. According to the Department of Education the level of population expansion envisaged in Midleton may generate a requirement for new schools over the medium to long term, subject to the timing and location of the growth. At a maximum, the Department estimates that up to two new primary schools could be required and up to one post-primary school. The Department states that the East Cork MD Draft plan meets these projected potential requirements. The Department also state that in order to meet post-primary requirements in the settlement in the short to medium term, increased capacity is being provided at two of the post-primary schools (St. Mary High School and St. Colman’s Community College).</p> <p>In the settlement of Youghal itself, there are three mainstream primary schools and one post-primary school. At primary level, there is no anticipated requirement for additional capacity in Youghal. At post-primary level, a relatively modest increase in enrolment is projected which could be accommodated by expansion of existing facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jim Luby &amp; Tom Rogers, Joint Statutory Receivers over certain assets of John &amp; Elaine Barry</b>
<b>DCDP346070563</b>	DCDP346070563
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission on behalf of Jim Luby &amp; Tom Rogers, Receivers relates to lands at Banshane, Midleton and expresses support for the residential zoning of part of their land at Abbeywood, Baneshane ( MD-R-01 and MD-R-02) and also concern at the proposed community/educational zoning on 2.1ha of their lands (MD-C-04) . It is considered that, as some of their original land holding has already been developed as a Gaelscoil, the allocation of more land for educational use is disproportionate. Permission for development of the land for housing was previously granted in 2006. Submission requests removal of the community/ education zoning and the rezoning of this land for residential use as there are plans to develop the area for housing and a creche. Submission questions the need for the MD-C-04 zoning and the need to cater for future educational demands. Submission also seeks a change to the wording of objective MD-R-02. At present the zoning objective indicates that the full development of the site is dependent on revised / improved access arrangements being available to the N25, and requires the development to be integrated with other land in</p>



	<p>the Baneshane area and linked to the town centre, it's railway station and the site identified as a possible second station to serve the town at Water-Rock. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is also required. Submission requests that Banshane be seen as a self-contained neighbourhood and that the dependency on revised / improved access arrangements on to the N25 and connectivity to the town centre, railway station etc.,and the requirement for a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and Road Safety Audit, be removed from the MD-R-02 objective. It is suggested that the new objective should simply read "Medium A Density Residential Development".</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need to zone lands at Baneshane (MD-C-04) for the expansion of the adjoining Gaelscoil)?</li> <li>2. Should the wording of objective MD-R-02 be revised to omit reference to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of the site being dependent on revised / improved access to the N25 ?</li> <li>• development of the site being linked to the town centre/ railway station and integrated with other land in the Baneshane area</li> <li>• the need for a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is also required.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Given the scale of development proposed at Banshane it is considered reasonable to make provision for the long-term expansion of educational facilities in the area. There are ample other zoned lands in the area to cater for residential use. The existing adjoining school is on a very confined site. It is intended to retain the existing wording in objective MD-R-02 in relation to the revised/improved access arrangements for the N25, need for a TIA and connectivity to the town centre etc.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joe FitzGerald</b>
<b>DCDP346111698</b>	DCDP346111698
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that MD-R-27 is not suitable for development as it overlooks the town and the area does not have the infrastructure for it.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John MacCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP344666882</b>	DCDP344666882
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that an area to the South of Roselawn Estate, Ballinacurra, Midleton, should be designated as Green Infrastructure (sub-category Green Conservation, GC). This area is currently located in the Metropolitan Greenbelt and is vital to the amenity of the community, because it acts as a green buffer between the Existing Residential (ER) area and the intrusion of the adjacent commercial Quarrying activities to the south. The submission states that the land is extremely vulnerable and that a Green Infrastructure Zoning is fully compatible with the Council's aims and objectives.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Mangan</b>
<b>DCDP345981985</b>	DCDP345981985
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to the zoning of MD-R-27 in Broomfield, Midleton and states that the location is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Current road infrastructure is inadequate to support the proposed development - roads are not suitable for large scale development traffic and are already heavily congested in Broomfield. Locals are already hindered with extra construction traffic.</li> <li>2) The Midleton waste water treatment plant is already at and over capacity.</li> <li>3) The road around the area is rural and a valuable amenity to those living in the area.</li> <li>4) The Biodiversity of the area will be impaired - the developer and development will not have consideration to the hedgerows and wildlife in the area.</li> <li>5) Noise pollution from development is already an issue from the existing construction at Blossom Hill.</li> <li>6) Midleton schools already struggle to accommodate existing students. Additional spaces need to be provided to allow for the increased population of the town.</li> </ol>

	7) No consideration has been given to the provision of local services in the area such as shop/school/creche.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Silke</b>
<b>DCDP345944201</b>	DCDP345944201
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of residential lands in the Broomfield area of Middleton for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health &amp; Safety: The area is currently over trafficked due to the recent additional developments in the area. Furthermore, the area is already used as a through road for numerous trucks to avoid the town. Adding additional residential traffic to this area will increase the risk to pedestrians. Ground/Surface water levels in the area have increased over the past 2 years, making external garden areas unsafe and unfit for purpose during the winter months, as a result of increased surface water in the areas.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure: There is inadequate infrastructure, in the form of roads, schools, shops and general amenities in the area. The addition of potentially hundreds of additional houses will further highlight this problem.</li> <li>3. Surface water: There is already an issue with surface water in the Broomfield / Poppyfield Drive area. In recent years, the rear gardens of multiple dwellings have been completely saturated as a result of what appears to be additional surface run off in the area. Introducing further hard surfaces in the area will only serve to exacerbate this issue.</li> </ol>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>KAREN WALSH</b>
<b>DCDP346287449</b>	DCDP346287449
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following concerns in relation to the development of MD-R-27 at Broomfield, Midleton.</p> <p>1) Lack of water services infrastructure and road infrastructure. The road network proposed to be upgraded under application 187236 does not extend to the main junction with the R626 and will result in significantly increased traffic through Avoncore Place which does not have adequate Pedestrian / Cycle facilities to accommodate the increased footfall to the train station or the town.</p> <p>2) Lack of formal public transport adding to car congestion.</p> <p>3) Zoning of land. Investment should be directed to the development of the Water Rock UEA which will provide 2460 residential units for the town. Broomfield has been developed without a town centre. If any further development is planned in this area it should be for the provision of a services and amenities and not additional houses which will exacerbate problems in the area.</p> <p>4) Housing Yield; densities in current ongoing development in the Broomfield area are lower than recommended in order to mitigate the negative impact on an elevated and prominent location. The loss of “elevated and prominent” Visual Amenity land within the metropolitan greenbelt visible from the entire town would be a poor trade for such low efficiency zoning given its aesthetic value.</p> <p>5) Visual Amenity; the proposed development would be in conflict with GI-8-1 of the 2014 Cork County Development Plan i.e. ‘Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt Areas requiring Special Protection’. The development would also be in conflict with objectives GI 14-16: ‘Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt Map’ and GI 14-9: ‘Landscape’ of the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and with paragraphs 14.10.1, 14.10.2 and 14.10.3. The submission states that the protection of the visual amenity land in the Metropolitan Green Belt and the protection of skylines and ridgelines are stated goals of the existing and proposed development plan. In the context of the poor Unit/Ha return on recent granted developments in this area, the rezoning of this land seems both incongruous with stated Cork County Council Policy and an inefficient use of key amenity land.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p>

	It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Katarina Szofka</b>
<b>DCDP345981304</b>	DCDP345981304
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 for residential development at Broomfield, Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</li> <li>- Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>- Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2) Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</li> <li>- Social infrastructure. The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) Existing issues. The submission also raises concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stormwater attenuation tank on main green. The ground on the main green subsided in September 2020 due to the collapse of the attenuation tank. No works were carried out on the tank for over nine months, meaning that the green area was off limits and a potential safety hazard. Castle Rock Homes cited COVID as a reason for not carrying out the essential works</li> </ul>

	<p>required on the attenuation tank, though they continued building new houses during Level 5 restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping. Castle Rock Homes has ceased cutting the grass or maintaining any of the gardens in the estate since mid-2020. The residents have had no option but to do some basic gardening and cutting of lawn despite the estate still being Castle Rock Homes's responsibility. In addition, some of the areas have not been landscaped at all.</li> <li>- Lack of Safety Fences. Several of the retaining walls have no safety barriers despite the significant dangers to residents, and especially children.</li> <li>- Lack of Screening for Privacy. Several gardens are overlooked by roads, but no adequate screening has been provided for privacy.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kate Moylan</b>
<b>DCDP339197923</b>	DCDP339197923
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south. The submission also states that the land is extremely vulnerable and is an ecosystem for local biodiversity and continued community welfare.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kenneth Lloyd</b>

<b>DCDP339399348</b>	DCDP339399348
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn/Rosehill Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south. The submission states that dust levels are already extremely high and if the green area is removed and the quarrying activity moves further towards the estate it could lead to health issues for residents of the estate.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin Daly</b>
<b>DCDP345782895</b>	DCDP345782895
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-25, MD-R-26 and MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons; 1) Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in substantial earthworks during the course of the development which will result in years of excessive dust, emissions, and noise pollution. The submission states that there are already problems with surface water run-off in the existing Blossom Hill estate where the stormwater tanks have collapsed and that the development of a larger site could result in more problems. 2) Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. 3) Roads/Infrastructure. The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services including roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights into Broomfield. 4) Facilities/Services. Lack of leisure facilities such as playgrounds in Broomfield. The Midleton area has a shortage of places in creches, primary schools and secondary schools. A large development in the proposed area will result in even more pressure on the existing facilities.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R25, MD-R26 and MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.



	<p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p> <p>It is not proposed to remove residential zonings MD-R-25 and MD-R-26 from the Development Plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kevin O'Reilly</b>
<b>DCDP344711162</b>	DCDP344711162
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Broomfield East in Midleton be zoned for medium density residential development. The land which is 1.46 ha in area is currently zoned MD-GC-01 in the Draft CDP 2021 and for Passive Open Space in the 2017 MD Local Area Plan. There is currently a dwelling house located on the site at the intersection of R-627 and L7630. The submission proposes that these lands would be more suitable for residential development.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to rezone an area of Green Infrastructure land for residential development at Broomfield in Midleton?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is sufficient land available within the development boundary of Midleton to accommodate the proposed future population growth for the town over the plan period. These lands are currently zoned MD-GC-01 for passive open space in the Draft Plan which states that this area is an important visual buffer to the railway line and creates an open space for informal recreation.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Killeagh/Inch Community Council</b>
<b>DCDP345814942</b>	DCDP345814942
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission from Killeagh Inch Community Council states that the water system for the village needs to be upgraded as the current water supply is working at full capacity. The submission also states that the graveyard on the Mogeely Road needs to be extended.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need to upgrade the water system for the Village of Killeagh. The graveyard on the Mogeely Road needs to be extended.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A proposed upgrade of the water supply scheme is planned for the village of Killeagh. See Volume 4 Chapter 3 Section 3.9 of the Draft Plan.  The expansion of the graveyard at Killeagh can be considered through normal development management procedures.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.9.3

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Liam Higgins (land owner) Kilva Midleton</b>
<b>DCDP345750443</b>	DCDP345750443
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that 4ha of land to the south west of Ballycotton Village are zoned for residential development. The lands are contiguous to the development boundary and are currently located in the Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Ballycotton for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Core Strategy allocates up to 45 houses to the settlement of Ballycotton during the plan period. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for residential development in Ballycotton to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan. See Volume 4, Chapter 3, Section 3.12, Objective DB-01 Ballycotton.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Liam Quaide</b>
<b>DCDP346296279</b>	DCDP346296279
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission outlines/proposes some general environmental / infrastructural aims for Cork Co. and the East Cork areas as well as some points on a rezoning proposal for Broomfield, Midleton as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Air pollution monitoring outside school where traffic congestion is a serious problem.</li> <li>2) Installation of water fountains in areas where there is a high footfall such as in public parks. This would significantly reduce plastic bottle use.</li> <li>3) Provision of Public bins/toilets in busy areas, including beaches. To share responsibility as a Council for waste management with takeaways and shops from where a large portion of waste is being generated.</li> <li>4) Transport in East Cork. To provide high-quality segregated cycle lanes to connect each urban centre including every village and major amenity tourist area on routes such as Whitegate to Midleton; Whitegate to Rostellan and Castlemartrayr to Ladysbridge. These routes would bring significant health, quality of life and tourism benefits to the area. Segregated cycleways to schools should also be prioritised.</li> <li>5) Biodiversity aims for Cork <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of the all-Ireland Pollinator Plan.</li> <li>• Plastic membrane weed-barrier should be phased out of Council-related or Council-commissioned landscaping projects with immediate effect.</li> <li>• The Council tree plan should be reviewed.</li> <li>• The use of glyphosate for anything other than invasive species control by the Council or any company or individual contracted by the Council should be phased out with immediate effect.</li> <li>• Cork Co. Council should collaborate with environmental groups such as Cork Nature Network and the Cork Environmental Forum to draw up strict guidelines for hedge-cutting</li> </ul> </li> <li>6) Motion by Allen O'Connor in October 2020 that a stance of opposition toward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the construction of new fossil fuel energy infrastructure (such as a liquid natural gas terminal in Cork Harbour) and</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the exploitation of as-yet-undeveloped fossil fuel resources, encompassing any infrastructure which might be constructed within the local authority's area to facilitate same be taken in the forthcoming County Development Plan</li> </ul> <p>7) Issues in relation to the proposed re-zoning of residential land in Broomfield (MD-R-27) as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of village centre/playgrounds/green space.</li> <li>• Infrastructural challenges.</li> <li>• Drainage risks.</li> <li>• Privacy/overlooking issues from elevated site.</li> <li>• Lack of Irish Water connections.</li> </ul> <p>The submission states that given the legacy of poor planning and developer-led planning that has caused so many problems nationwide it would make more sense for the focus of development in the local East Cork area to be on the realisation of the Waterrock UEA.. This would serve as a model for development in other parts of East Cork. Broomfield requires a similar level of holistic planning that would incorporate all the features of a sustainable community to serve both its current population and any increased population into the future.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Should there be air pollution monitoring outside schools?</li> <li>2) Should water fountains be installed in public areas?</li> <li>3) Should public bins/toilets be provided in busy areas including beaches?</li> <li>4) Should high quality segregated cycle lanes be provided in East Cork to connect urban centres?</li> <li>5) Biodiversity</li> <li>6) Opposition towards Fossil Fuel Infrastructure</li> <li>7) Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is not within the remit of the plan to consider air pollution monitoring outside schools.</li> <li>2) It is not within the remit of the plan to provide for water fountains in public areas.</li> <li>3) Public bins and toilets are included in busy areas by Cork County Council, including beaches.</li> <li>4) In Midleton, the implementation of CMATS sustainable transport measures (walking, cycling and public transport), connecting with and within Midleton will be carried out during the lifetime of this plan. In Youghal, the provision of new / widened footpaths and segregated cycle tracks and public lighting will be provided as required to enhance connectivity to schools, from the greenway to the town centre and to leisure centre/beach area / holiday parks /leisure walking route/ Youghal Boardwalk.</li> <li>5) Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Implementation of the all-Ireland Pollinator Plan.</u> See objectives BE15-9 (b), BE 15-5(e) and BE 15-9(c). In addition, CCC has recently (July) voted in favour of Council becoming a supporter of the AIPP.</li> <li>• <u>Plastic membrane weed-barrier should be phased out of Council-related or Council-commissioned landscaping projects with</u></li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<p><u>immediate effect</u>. The Ecology Office supports this recommendation. Policy BE 15-4 requires the Council to ensure that biodiversity protection is considered at design and planning stages for its own new projects. Suggest that including a commitment at this level of detail would not be appropriate for the CDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The Council tree plan should be reviewed</u>. See BE 15-8. Further consideration could also be given to this recommendation as part of the process of developing the new County Biodiversity Action Plan.</li> <li>• <u>The use of glyphosate for anything other than invasive species control by the Council or any company or individual contracted by the Council should be phased out with immediate effect</u>. The Ecology Office supports this recommendation. Suggest that this level of detail is not appropriate for the CDP. Invasive species policy will be dealt with in further detail through the development and implementation of the County Biodiversity Action Plan.</li> <li>• <u>Cork Co. Council should collaborate with environmental groups such as Cork Nature Network and the Cork Environmental Forum to draw up strict guidelines for hedge-cutting</u>. The Council is currently working to update its Roadside Boundaries Policy document. The document is being prepared with input from the Ecology Office. Awaiting confirmation from the Roads department that they are going take account of the AIPP/TII document when they are updating the Roadside Boundaries policy document.</li> </ul> <p>6) A notice of motion on this issue has already been debated and defeated by the Council.</p> <p>7) The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Linda O Shea</b>
<b>DCDP346076643</b>	DCDP346076643
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Park South, Old Youghal Road, Midleton be included within the existing built up area as it is inside the Midleton Development boundary. The site is presently part of the industrial zoned site (MD-I-01). The submission states that the lands adjoin existing residential houses in an area which can accommodate some growth.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	That lands at Park South, Old Youghal Road in Midleton be included in the existing built up area. Site is presently part of MD-I-01.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are affected by the proposed northern relief road route options (MD-U-01) and it would be premature to change the zoning in this area until a route has been finalised. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mairead &amp; Peter Bowden</b>
<b>DCDP339188527</b>	DCDP339188527

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Margaret Ronan</b>
<b>DCDP341408770</b>	DCDP341408770
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission raises concerns in relation to the traffic that will be generated from proposed residential zonings at Broomfield in Midleton (MD-R-24, MD-R-25, MD-R-26, and MD-R-27). The submission states that currently the traffic leading to the main junction at the Mill Road is backed up into Broomfield estate every morning due to excess traffic and the railway crossing. The submission raises the point that the road network in Midleton needs to be considered before zoning any additional land for residential development in the area. The submission also refers to native ditches and trees in the area which may be lost if any further residential development takes place in the area and to the possible negative impact on the air quality.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-24, MD-R-25, MD-R-26, and MDR-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.  As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.  It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.  It is not intended to remove residential zonings MD-R-24, MD-R25 and MD-R-26 from the Development Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Maria Murphy</b>

<b>DCDP345666484</b>	DCDP345666484
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of lands for residential development at Broomfield East in Midleton from an environmental and geographic perspective.</p> <p>This submission states that this area has traditionally been an amenity area which abounds in wildlife-bats, badgers and birds (it is on the migratory path of Lapwings) and provides a vista of East Cork. The area developed lower down on the hill has blighted the environment with concrete retaining walls.</p> <p>The submission also states that there is no water, sewerage and roads infrastructure available to cater for further development in the area. In addition, development on the hill would blight the topography and appearance of the town, increasing water off-flow from the hill to lower ground which could cause flooding.</p> <p>The town needs more open spaces, not 500 houses and apartments.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands at Broomfield have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mark Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP346011443</b>	DCDP346011443
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the Council consider installing safety measures/re-design to protect Vulnerable Road Users at the 5-way junction in the centre of Ladysbridge village. The submission states that this is currently a hazardous junction for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic with near misses occurring on a daily basis.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need to redesign the 5-way junction in the centre of Ladysbridge Village.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Site specific road improvement of this nature are not a matter for the County Development Plan and should be addressed with the local Municipal District Office.</p> <p>There is some road re-lining planned at this junction.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Ryan</b>
<b>DCDP339222786</b>	DCDP339222786

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is extremely important to local residents as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the commercial quarrying activity to the south.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary O'Leary</b>
<b>DCDP346247919</b>	DCDP346247919
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons; 1) inadequate drainage: The water is flowing down the hill and accumulating at the base. Thus, flooding the back gardens of the houses of Poppyfields Drive since the Blossom Hill development. 2) Health and Safety Risk: Thousands of tonnes of soil have been moved to facilitate the building of Blossom Hill and no doubt similar volumes of soil will be moved in the future development of the land in question. The soil has not settled and could cause problems such as subsidence, soil movement, landslides etc in the future. 3) Steep Roads: The roads through Blossom Hill and the roads through the proposed development are/will be steep and treacherous in ice and snowy weather. 4) Lack of privacy: overlooking into neighbouring dwellings due to the steep nature of the site. 5) Overdevelopment in one area when there are more suitable sites available in the town, for example, on both the Cork side and the Youghal side off the N25. 6) Inadequate road and social infrastructure including pitches, playgrounds, community facilities, crèches and schools particularly secondary schools.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.  As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.



	<p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p> <p>It is not intended to remove residential zonings MD-R-24, MD-R25 and MD-R-26 from the Development Plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Maurice Ring</b>
<b>DCDP345973770</b>	DCDP345973770
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following concerns in relation to further development at Broomfield in Midleton;</p> <p>1) Road Network: The Broomfield Road Network and the R-626/L-7630 junction do not have the capacity to carry increased volumes of traffic. A Traffic Management survey carried out in 2018 in support of the Park Hill View Estates development states that this junction was operating close to capacity for the morning peak and that in future years would exceed it.</p> <p>2) Services: The Water and Waste Water services are at capacity and will need major upgrade works prior to any further developments.</p> <p>3) Environmental Impact. A Full Environmental impact study needs to be carried out prior to any development as a development on the scale envisaged would have a detrimental impact.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p> <p>It is not intended to remove residential zonings MD-R-24, MD-R25 and MD-R-26 from the Development Plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael and Julia Philips</b>
<b>DCDP345569552</b>	DCDP345569552
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests increased protection around Kilmahon House (a protected structure No 01478) and lands adjoining Ballycotton Bay south of Kilmahon House in Shanagarry by the rezoning of lands surrounding the house as open space. The Northern section of the proposed lands are within the Development Boundary of Shanagarry, and the southern section of the proposed lands are outside of the development boundary but within the Rural Housing Control area "Rural area under strong Urban Influence".

<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Request for increased protection around Kilmahon House in Shanagarry (protected structure no. 01478).
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is sufficient land within the development boundary of Shanagarry to allow for the protection of Kilmahon House.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Cashman</b>
<b>DCDP344074919</b>	DCDP344074919
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to 3 parcels of land at Castleredmond, Midleton. The first parcel of land is .98 ha in area and is zoned for Medium A Density Residential Development in the 2017 East Cork MD LAP. It is proposed to rezone these lands to 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' in the Draft Plan 2021. The submission requests that the current zoning for Medium A Residential Development remain on the lands.</p> <p>The 2nd parcel of land is 5.48 ha in area and is zoned for Open Space in the 2017 East Cork MD LAP. The land is zoned for Green Infrastructure MD-GC-07 in the Draft Plan. The submission proposes that the northern portion of these lands be zoned for residential development while the lower southern portion be retained as Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>The 3rd parcel of land is zoned for 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Use' and the submission proposes that these lands are zoned for Medium A Density Residential Development.</p> <p>The 3 parcels of land referred to are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure and Existing Residential.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for zoning additional land for residential development at Castleredmond in Midleton.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Two of the proposed sites in the submission are zoned 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses (ER). Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties. It is not intended to change this proposal to Residential as the sites are small in area and considered to be more suitable as infill sites.</p> <p>The third site is presently zoned as part of a Green Infrastructure Zoning (MD-GC-07), is a prominent slope that makes a significant contribution to the rural character of Ballinacurra. That zoning is considered appropriate and no change is proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Farrell</b>
<b>DCDP346029639</b>	DCDP346029639

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Springfield Youghal be zoned for residential development. The lands which are approximately 2.63 hectares in area are zoned as agriculture as part of YL-AG-04 in the Draft CDP 2021. The submission proposes that YL-R-04 be extended to include the proposed lands. The lands are zoned for residential (restricted) development in the Youghal Town Plan 2009-2015. The submission states that the site is strategically located on the western entrance to the town, within close proximity to Pobalscoil na Tríonóide, a mixed post primary school with a current enrolment of 977 pupils, it is within walking distance of the local services including convenience stores, GAA, Rugby, Soccer and Athletic grounds.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for zoning of additional residential lands at Springfield in Youghal?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is sufficient land available for residential development in Youghal to meet the population growth target identified for the town in the Core Strategy of the Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Mullane</b>
<b>DCDP344067692</b>	DCDP344067692
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to lands to the north of Youghal Town at Foxhole which are zoned for green infrastructure YL-GC-07 and YL-GA-18 in the Draft Plan. The submission proposes that YL-B-04 be extended to include surrounding lands which presently form part of YL-GA-18 in the Draft Plan. The submission states that the site is an ideal location for a variety of business uses given its proximity to the N25 by-pass of Youghal. The submission acknowledges that the site abuts a significant habitat and states that mitigation measures will be required to permit development. The submission also includes details in relation to levels and flooding on these lands.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should YL-B-04 in Youghal be extended to include additional lands to the north and west?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There are significant areas of flood risk located on the proposed lands and they are not generally considered suitable for development, other than as provided for by Draft Plan objective YL-GA-18. Given the flood risk shown on the updated flood risk map for Youghal it is also proposed to amend the plan to omit zoning objective YL B-04 and include the site in the adjoining green infrastructure zoning YL-GA-18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Midleton Football Club</b>
<b>DCDP345909166</b>	DCDP345909166
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission from Midleton Football Club requests that Cork County Council help to provide facilities for the growing community in Midleton and states that the Clubs current facilities at Knockgriffin are far beyond

	<p>capacity. The club is currently investing €500,000 in an all weather pitch to alleviate some of the capacity issue.</p> <p>The club has a membership waiting list and further growth in demand through the population increase proposed in the Draft County Development Plan will make it impossible for the club to cater for all the young people in the community.</p> <p>The submission states that sites zoned for recreational and community use in the Development plan are not suitable to meet this demand.</p> <p>The club submits the following proposals for amendment to the draft plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That suitable land be zoned (approx. 10 acres) for recreational use to allow for the development of 3 new pitches for use by Midleton Soccer Club.</li> <li>• That provision in the development plan be made to assist the Club in providing a suitable vehicular entrance to the existing club house and pitches located at Knockgriffin.</li> <li>• There may be an opportunity to provide a full-sized All-Weather facility on the Linear Park by Owenacurra (MD-GR-08) as a way of relieving the current pressure on pitch facilities in the town.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>The need to zone suitable land to provide additional facilities for Midleton Football Club.</p> <p>The need to provide a suitable vehicular entrance to the existing club house and pitches at Knockgriffin.</p> <p>Look at opportunity to provide a full sized All Weather facility for the club on recreation lands zoned MD-GR-08.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>MD-G-04 in Midleton is zoned for Midleton Football club at present. The objective is to 'Maintain the existing pitch and sports facilities for Midleton FC. Proposals for new or improved sports related facilities may be permitted. The Planning Authority acknowledge that the club needs bigger facilities to allow for the development of 3 new pitches. The GR-08 Linear Park objective makes provision for playing pitches and a full sized all weather facility may be permitted here for public use in the future subject to normal proper planning consideration. The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. The future needs of Clubs like Midleton Football Club will be considered in this review. See Paragraph 14.5.5.</p> <p>The provision of a suitable vehicular entrance for the club at Knockgriffin can be dealt with through the Development Management Process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Midleton Skip Hire LTD.</b>
<b>DCDP345811005</b>	DCDP345811005

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to zoning objective MD-HT-02 in Midleton. The submitter welcomes the inclusion of wording in this objective which states that 'the function and amenity of any existing commercial active uses are to be protected through the redevelopment of the site'.</p> <p>The submission provides the following information to further re-enforce the objective;</p> <p>1) The amenity is a great asset to the town and has been operating for many years.</p> <p>2) A suitable buffer zone should be provided to safeguard this business.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>Suggested amendment to wording of objective MD-HT-02 in Midleton to include the following additional wording;</p> <p>The amenity is a great asset to the town and has been operating for many years.</p> <p>A suitable buffer zone should be provided to safeguard this business.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to include the proposed wording as part of the High Technology Campus Development Objective MD-HT-02. All issues relevant to the development of the MD-HT-02 site, and the need for buffer zones, will be considered as part of the development management process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Niall O'Sullivan</b></p>
<b>DCDP341766104</b>	<p>DCDP341766104</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to the proposed zoning of residential lands MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton and states that there is not enough infrastructure in Broomfield and the surrounding areas for another housing development. The submission states that any residential development on lands zoned MD-R-27 will have a significant negative impact on traffic, noise and light pollution and overall quality of life in Midleton.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<p><b>Nicholas Flavin</b></p>
<b>DCDP346009825</b>	<p>DCDP346009825</p>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that lands at Parkmountain in Youghal, adjoining Youghal Business Park, be zoned for a Neighbourhood Centre ( Small Scale Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centre servicing the local community only and of</p>

	<p>such a scale as to avoid competing with or detracting from the services provided by the traditional town centre). The site is 1.2 ha in area and is presently zoned for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses. The submission states that the site is strategically located on the western entrance to the town, within close proximity to Pobalscoil na Tríonóide, a mixed post primary school with a current enrolment of 977 pupils, and is surrounded by a well established, recent and future residential housing schemes.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for a small-scale mixed-use neighbourhood centre at Parkmountain in Youghal?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The proposed site is presently zoned for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial use and comprises the undeveloped portion of the Youghal Business Park which contains a range of modern business / small industrial units and complements the IDA Springfield estate across the road.</p> <p>Youghal would benefit enormously from growth in its employment base and it is important to retain capacity for new employment uses to develop. The site the subject of this submission provides such an opportunity. It is interesting to note that an older industrial unit on the IDA site directly cross the road from this site has recently been renovated and modernised, having been idle for many years.</p> <p>In terms of local shops this area of Youghal is currently served by an Apple Green filling station and small forecourt shop on Upper Cork Hill, approximately 700m to the east of the site, en route to the town centre. There is a Supervalu, Tesco and Lidl within 1.4-1.6 Km of the site in the town centre. While it is acknowledged that this area of Youghal might benefit from a modern corner shop, it is unclear if the market is there for it. Rezoning this 1.2ha site for neighbourhood centre uses so close to the town centre is not considered appropriate given its proximity to the town centre , the likely level of demand for such uses in this area, and the level of vacancy in the town centre.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nigel Dawson</b>
<b>DCDP345339456</b>	DCDP345339456
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 for residential development at Broomfield, Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site</li> </ul>

	<p>has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>- Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2) Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</li> <li>- Social infrastructure. The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) Existing issues. The submission raises a number of concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stormwater attenuation tank on main green. The ground on the main green subsided in September 2020 due to the collapse of the attenuation tank. No works were carried out on the tank for over nine months, meaning that the green area was off limits and a potential safety hazard. Castle Rock Homes cited COVID as a reason for not carrying out the essential works required on the attenuation tank, though they continued building new houses during Level 5 restrictions.</li> <li>- Lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping. Castle Rock Homes has ceased cutting the grass or maintaining any of the gardens in the estate since mid-2020. The residents have had no option but to do some basic gardening and cutting of lawn despite the estate still being Castle Rock Homes's responsibility. In addition, some of the areas have not been landscaped at all.</li> <li>- Lack of Safety Fences. Several of the retaining walls have no safety barriers despite the significant dangers to residents, and especially children.</li> <li>- Lack of Screening for Privacy. Several gardens are overlooked by roads, but no adequate screening has been provided for privacy.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.



	<p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Noel Day</b>
<b>DCDP341977956</b>	DCDP341977956
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that approximately 1.25 acres of land at Ballincarrooning, Whitegate which are currently zoned for Passive Open Space in the 2017 East Cork Local Area Plan and as Green Infrastructure in the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 be rezoned for residential development. The submission states that the site is close to all amenities in Whitegate Village including the primary school and would be ideally suited for residential development.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to zone alternative lands for residential development in Whitegate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Additional lands are not required for residential use in Whitegate. The lands proposed seem to be part of a walled garden and landscaped grounds associated with Whitegate house, a protected structure noted as being of Regional significance in the NIAH.</p> <p>Lands zoned for green infrastructure need to be protected for that use. The lands in question form part of green infrastructure zoning WG-GC-07, have mature tree cover and are important in long distance views across the harbour and provide important visual and physical separation between the villages of Whitegate and industrial areas to the north and east.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Flynn Construction</b>
<b>DCDP346014243</b>	DCDP346014243
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission prepared on behalf of O'Flynn Construction is in relation to lands at Baneshane in Midleton. The purpose of this submission is to support the residential and business use zoning of these lands. OFC wish to reconfirm their intention and commitment to the development of the residential and business zoned parcels within the short to medium term.</p> <p>The lands which are proposed as Medium-A Residential Development (MD-R-28) and business uses (MD-B-01) in the draft Cork County Development Plan. The submission welcomes these zoning provisions.</p> <p>In adopting the zonings, the submission requests that the MD-R-28 and MD-B-01 specific objectives are modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend objective MD-R-28 so that the lands are simply zoned "Medium A</li> </ul>

	<p>Density Residential Development” .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend objective MD-B-01 and Paragraph 3.3.49 so that “high employment density” are not precluded and the requirement for a TIA/RSA is omitted from the MD-B-01 specific objective.</li> <li>• Provide greater accuracy in relation to flood risk mapping once the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been completed.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests that the MD-R-28 and MD-B-01 specific objectives are modified as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Amend objective MD-R-28 so that the lands are simply zoned “Medium A Density Residential Development”, i.e. no reference to traffic / roads issues .</li> <li>b) Amend objective MD - -B-01 and Paragraph 3.3.49 so that “high employment density” are not precluded and the requirement for a TIA/RSA is omitted from the MD-B-01 specific objective.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Provide greater accuracy in relation to flood risk mapping once the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been completed.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) There is sufficient residential land identified in the plan to meet the growth target for Midleton. As part of the amendments to the Core Strategy of the Plan for Midleton, it is proposed to re-categorise MD-R-28 as ‘Residential Reserve.’ In it considered appropriate, in the interests of public safety, the protection of the strategic nature of the national roads infrastructure and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to retain the traffic related requirements of the objective as currently drafted.</li> <li>(b) These lands are not considered suitable for high employment density uses given their peripheral nature relative to the town as a whole, the town centre and distance from the railway station(s). In addition, in it considered appropriate in the interests of public safety, the protection of the strategic nature of the national roads infrastructure and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to retain the traffic related requirements of the objective as currently drafted.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The Midleton Flood risk map has been updated in the plan, showing fluvial and tidal risks affecting the site. Flood risks from other sources are not reflected on the map and will need to be assessed at project stage.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Amendment required to Core Strategy for Midleton – see Amendment No</li> <li>(b) No Amendment Required.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Olivier Compagnon</b>

DCDP343379906	DCDP343379906
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 for residential development at Broomfield, Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</li> <li>- Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>- Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2) Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</li> <li>- Social infrastructure. The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) Existing issues. The submission raises a number of concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stormwater attenuation tank on main green. The ground on the main green subsided in September 2020 due to the collapse of the attenuation tank. No works were carried out on the tank for over nine months, meaning that the green area was off limits and a potential safety hazard. Castle Rock Homes cited COVID as a reason for not carrying out the essential works required on the attenuation tank, though they continued building new houses during Level 5 restrictions.</li> <li>- Lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping. Castle Rock Homes has ceased cutting the grass or maintaining any of the gardens in the estate since mid-2020. The residents have had no option but to do some basic gardening and cutting of lawn despite the estate still being Castle Rock Homes's responsibility. In addition, some of the areas have not been landscaped at all.</li> </ul>

	<p>- Lack of Safety Fences. Several of the retaining walls have no safety barriers despite the significant dangers to residents, and especially children.</p> <p>- Lack of Screening for Privacy. Several gardens are overlooked by roads, but no adequate screening has been provided for privacy.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Padraig O Neill</b>
<b>DCDP343427312</b>	DCDP343427312
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Height and scale of the proposed development which will result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>2) Elevated nature of the site which will cause a potential eyesore viewed from a number of locations and approaches to the town.</li> <li>3) Proposed layout for MD-R-27 is a risk to current road users which is used as a walk by local residents.</li> <li>4) Unsuitability of the already congested road infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic.</li> <li>5) Lack of cycle and pedestrian connectivity to the town from the existing Broomfield development and the proposed development at MD-R-27.</li> <li>6) More suitable sites available in the town at Water-Rock which has already been planned and where key road infrastructure such as the Northern relief road is already in place.</li> <li>7) The rezoning of this land is not based on the principles of sustainable communities to achieve density while providing essential amenities, connectivity, green spaces and avoid congestion.</li> </ol> <p>This submission also includes a number of photographic attachments which show impact on light and privacy, impact on road users and the traffic and visual impact of the proposed development.</p>

<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Paul &amp; Ruth Hourigan</b>
<b>DCDP339498070</b>	DCDP339498070
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that land to the south of Roselawn Housing Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton be zoned for Green Infrastructure. The land is currently located outside of the Midleton Town Development Boundary and is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The submission states that the land is vital to the amenity of the area as it acts as a green buffer between the residential area to the north and the intrusion of noise and pollutants coming from the commercial quarrying activity to the south.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Paul White</b>
<b>DCDP346259193</b>	DCDP346259193
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The purpose of this submission is to request 5.7 hectares of land at Muckridge and Foxhole in Youghal is zoned as Business and General Employment (B) use, this zoning would facilitate opportunities for a wide range of compatible business and general employment uses including small/medium scale manufacturing/warehousing/distribution uses. The lands are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure Active (YL-GA-18) and Green Infrastructure Conservation (YL-GC-01) in the Draft Plan.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands at Muckridge and Foxhole in Youghal which are presently zoned for Green Infrastructure be zoned for Business and General Employment in the CDP?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There are significant areas of flood risk located on the proposed lands and they are not generally considered suitable for development, other than as provided for by Draft Plan objective YL-GA-18.

	Given the flood risk shown on the updated flood risk map for Youghal it is also proposed to amend the plan to omit zoning objective YL B-04 and include the site in the adjoining green infrastructure zoning YL-GA-18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Roisin Cuddihy</b>
<b>DCDP346297424</b>	DCDP346297424
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises the following concerns in relation to the zoning of MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton;</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of the site due its steep nature. The levelling of the site will result in substantial earthworks during the course of the development which will result in years of excessive dust, emissions, and noise pollution. The submission states that there are already problems with surface water run-off in the existing Blossom Hill estate and that the development of a larger site could result in more problems.</p> <p>2) Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</p> <p>3) Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls.</p> <p>4) Lack of Adequate Services. The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services including roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights into Broomfield.</p> <p>5) Social infrastructure. There are no leisure facilities such as playgrounds in Broomfield, as well as a ack of green spaces, shops, community centres and other amenities to support even the existing population. A 300-500 unit increase in housing will turn Broomfield into a vast residential area without the amenities and services that would make it a sustainable, family-centred community.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ronan McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP341737027</b>	DCDP341737027
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission opposes the zoning of a parcel of land in Midleton due to the site being elevated and the relevant infrastructure not being in place

	however it is not clear from the submission which land the submitter is referring to as there is no reference to any particular zoning in the Draft Plan.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	It is not clear from the submission as to the location of the parcel of land in question.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Saleen &amp; District Residents' Association</b>
<b>DCDP344908522</b>	DCDP344908522
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission by Saleen &amp; District Residents' Association raises the following two points for consideration in the County Development Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Saleen &amp; District Residents' Association asks that Cork County Council urgently prioritises the implementation of the Integrated Constructed Wetland project for Saleen village.</li> <li>2. Saleen &amp; District Residents' Association asks that a cycleway from Whitegate, via Saleen, to Midleton is included when considering the identification of new cycling routes under 'Active Travel Investment' proposals.</li> </ol> <p>The submission states the R630 is a very dangerous road for cyclists and pedestrians due to the huge volumes of oil tankers (more than 200 per day) and a substantial amount of heavy machinery serving a large agricultural area. Developing safe connectivity (approx. 3 km) between Saleen and Midleton would promote active travel by families, children and commuters and the wellbeing and recreation of the community.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests that Cork County Council prioritises the implementation of the Integrated Constructed Wetland project for Saleen Village.</li> <li>2. Requests that a cycleway from Whitegate via Saleen to Midleton is included when identifying new cycle routes.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permission was granted to IW to construct a wastewater treatment facility which includes an Integrated Constructed Wetland. The land has high biodiversity value and it is therefore not considered appropriate to zone it for development. Woodland cover should be retained. Other uses including for recreation (e.g. development of nature trail) could be compatible with protection of biodiversity resource.</li> <li>2. There are no plans at present to include a cycleway from Whitegate, via Saleen, to Midleton.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sarah Silke</b>
<b>DCDP343876561</b>	DCDP343876561



<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission outlines a number of concerns in relation to proposed residential zoning MD-R-27 at Broomfield in Midleton. The following issues are raised;</p> <p>1) Drainage – the site is on a steep hill. There are already existing drainage issues in the unfinished Blossomhill estate. A large sinkhole developed on the green area in Blossomhill due to a collapsed attenuation tank. Poppyfields Drive has waterlogged gardens and water coming through retaining walls.</p> <p>2) Health and Safety – An increase in water logging coupled with high retaining walls could create dangerous circumstances for residents living in these estates.</p> <p>3) Traffic Congestion - The development will cause increased traffic congestion on an already congested road.</p> <p>4) Lack of amenities - The proposed residential development coupled with existing estates will create a densely populated area where there are no recreational amenities.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.</p> <p>As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Seamus Lantry</b>
<b>DCDP346109936</b>	DCDP346109936
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission states that the greatest Economic asset in East Cork is the stretch of strand in the townlands of Claycastle, Summerfield, Redbarn, Clonard and Pilmore. The submission proposes the following in relation to these townlands;</p> <p>1. The sea front be developed for tourism and associated accommodation so as to obtain maximum employment and economic benefits locally. A 480-metre-deep section along the sea front of Summerfield, Redbarn and Clonard should be zoned for tourism and associated residential facilities. This proposal would have no effect on Ballyvergan marsh and both Claycastle and Pilmore will be environmentally protected areas.</p> <p>2. The system of groynes protecting the sand on the beaches has deteriorated and the sand level has fallen as a result. It is proposed that the Office of Public Works will be encouraged and facilitated in replacing and maintaining the groyne system so as to raise the sand levels and to protect</p>

	the boardwalk and stop coastal erosion.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To develop lands in the townlands of Claycastle, Summerfield, Redbarn, Clonard and Pilmore for tourism related development.</li> <li>2. To encourage and facilitate the Office of Public Works to replace and maintain the groyne system along Youghal coastline.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The townlands of Claycastle, Summerfield, Redbarn, Clonard and Pilmore occupy a large stretch of sensitive coastline where it is necessary balance competing demands for development with the protection of the environment. Volume One of the Development Plan sets out settlement strategy of the Planning Authority and the approach to development generally across the settlement network of the county and in rural areas. Chapter 10 of the Plan details policies specifically in relation to the tourism. Chapter 7 deals with Marine, Coastal and Island Areas, while Chapter 15 deals with Biodiversity and Environment. The Tourism Chapter of the plan seeks to promote a sustainable and well managed tourism industry which protects the environment and heritage assets of the county. Tourism is encouraged throughout the county and many coastal towns and villages have a significant tourism role already.  The policies of the draft plan are considered appropriate and sufficient in this regard. No change proposed.</li> <li>2. Maintenance of drainage systems is a matter for the OPW and is beyond the scope of the Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Shane Scanlan</b>
<b>DCDP344886213</b>	DCDP344886213
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to proposed residential zoning MD-R-27 in Broomfield, Midleton. The submission states that the proposed zoning will create a number of serious issues in an already densely populated area and in particular, will put pressure on the already limited infrastructure. The submission also refers to the elevated nature of the site and requests that consideration be given to the negative precedence this zoning will create for development in the town.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve.  As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.

	It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith</b>
<b>DCDP344581368</b>	DCDP344581368
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to the R632 Regional road junction at the bridge in Castlemartyr Village. The submission states that when approaching the junction during the day from the Ladysbridge Road direction it is significantly congested for commuters travelling through the village. The submission refers specifically to a disabled car parking space next to the bridge which is preventing motorists from being able to get into the left hand lane adding further to the backlog of traffic. The submission suggests that the disabled space be moved into the centre of the village or to the other side of the road.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to move the disabled car parking space at the Ladysbridge side of the R632 junction at Castlemartyr bridge to the other side of the road in order to alleviate traffic congestion at the junction?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Cork County Council is advancing a footpath along the Ladysbridge Road between the traffic lights and hotel. Ancillary to these works will be the formalising of parking on what is currently the hard shoulder. The detailed design will consider this issue and the enhancement of disabled persons parking facilities at the location.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.6.7.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith</b>
<b>DCDP342490193</b>	DCDP342490193
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission raises concerns in relation to the safety of 'Long Acre Walk' on the Ladysbridge to Garryvoe Road. This walk is a local amenity walk which was funded by Cork County Council in 2017. The submission states that the paths temporary stone surface is not suitable for buggies, young children on bikes or scooters, individuals with limited mobility and wheelchair uses. Due to the unsuitable temporary surface members of the public have to walk on the busy main road. The submission states that this is an essential walking path for locals and needs to be urgently upgraded to a suitable permanent surface to enable this much needed local walkway to be accessible, inclusive, and safe for all residents to use.</p> <p>This stone path has been washed away on a number of occasions during high rain and has been damaged from tractors driving over the path to access fields. The submission includes photographs of the path which were taken in December 2020 and June 2021 and states that this matter has been brought to the attention of local TDs, County Councillors and the SEO in the area.</p> <p>The submission also refers to Age Action Irelands view that the design of a</p>

	community's environment and the provision of safe footpaths can often become the determining factor between a healthy and active lifestyle or one characterised by limited mobility and high levels of social isolation. The submission concludes by stating that this pathway is a major road safety concern which needs to be upgraded by Cork County Council as a matter of urgency before there is a fatality on this road.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need to upgrade the temporary surface of the 'Long Acre Walk' on the Ladysbridge to Garryvoe Road to a permanent surface to allow access for all including buggies, bikes etc.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The 'Long Acre Walk' on the Ladysbridge to Garryvoe Road was developed and is maintained by a Community Group. The walk is to trail standards and is in a non-urban area. There is no proposal by Cork County Council (or funding) to take in charge and upgrade to a shared cycle / pedestrian footpath standard.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith</b>
<b>DCDP342922317</b>	DCDP342922317
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that provision be urgently made for a childcare facility i.e. a creche in Ladysbridge prior to any further residential development taking place in the village. The submission states that at present the village does not have a creche or a primary school and that the nearby creche in Castlemartyr is currently at maximum capacity. There is an ECCE service due to open in the village but the submission states that this will not be a creche and will only cater for preschool children between 3 – 5 years old.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need for childcare facilities and a school in Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify the need for a primary school in Ladysbridge. The 2011 Local Area Plan had identified a site for a new primary school within the village, however the Department of Education confirmed during the review of the 2011 Local Area Plan that this school site is no longer required and those lands are now included within the development boundary.</p> <p>Objective SC 6-4 'Childcare Facilities' in Chapter 6 of this plan seeks the provision of childcare facilities concurrent with development and there is adequate scope within the development boundary of Ladysbridge to cater for such facilities.</p> <p>Additional text will be included in the Plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village including childcare and sports facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith</b>
<b>DCDP346247234</b>	DCDP346247234

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission states that Ladysbridge has no outdoor active play areas/ play amenities and has no playing pitches. A playground and an active outdoor green area are urgently needed for the children in the village.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to provide outdoor play areas/amenities including pitches in the village of Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Additional text will be included in the Plan to encourage the development of community uses in the village including childcare and sports facilities.</p> <p>There is an existing Green Infrastructure Amenity Zoning Objective in the village to cater for a new open space and recreation area.</p> <p>The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. See Paragraph 14.5.5.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text Amendment Required. See Amendment no. 4.3.15.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP343124824</b>	DCDP343124824
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that consideration be given to the need for a primary school in the village of Ladysbridge. The submission states that Ladysbridge has a lot of young children of school going age who at present have to travel 7km to attend Kilcredan National School and therefore can not walk or cycle to school. The submission states that many other villages in the East Cork area have national schools in the centre of the village and that having a school in a village is an essential amenity which serves to bring the community together, reduce social isolation and enhance quality of life for children.</p> <p>The submission refers to the 2011 Midleton Local Area Plan in which a new primary school site was identified for Ladysbridge however the submission states that this was considered to be not required at the time by the Dept. of Education.</p> <p>The submission requests that the need for a primary school be urgently reviewed, particularly due to the influx of young families over the last 10 years and given future plans for the village to grow over the coming years, in order to continue to attract young families into Ladysbridge.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for a primary school in Ladysbridge?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Department of Education outlined their requirements for the provision of education facilities based on the Core Strategy figures in the Draft Plan. They did not identify the need for a primary school in Ladysbridge. The 2011 Local Area Plan had identified a site for a new primary school within the village, however the Department of Education confirmed during the review of the 2011 Local Area Plan that this school site is no longer required and those lands are now included within the development boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sharon Smith Ladysbridge</b>
<b>DCDP343745437</b>	DCDP343745437
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission refers to the urgent need for a footpath connection between the villages of Castlemartyr and Ladysbridge. The submission states that the approximate 1km footpath would provide social, economic and health benefits for the residents of both villages while also contributing positively towards climate change. The submission also states that the residents of Ladysbridge currently have no access to public transport options in the village.</p> <p>The submission refers to the Department of Transports objective to find new sustainable mobility options through inclusive active travel measures such as the provision of pedestrian and cycle networks which would allow access to nearby public transport stops to prevent rural social exclusion.</p> <p>The submission also refers to Cork County Council and its view that 'transport is a key enabler of all economic and social activities, is linked to quality of life, health and wellbeing. The Draft County Development Plan supports a shift to sustainable modes, walking, cycling and public transport.'</p> <p>The submission concludes by stating that the footpath needs to be urgently provided to allow inclusive active travel connectivity between the two villages.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	The need for a footpath connection between Castlemartyr and Ladysbridge.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Cork County Council has sought funding from the NTA to conduct a feasibility study to identify costings for the provision of a link footpath from Castlemartyr GAA grounds to Ladysbridge. The NTA has not approved funding at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Solas Financial</b>
<b>DCDP345490752</b>	DCDP345490752
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that lands in Castlemartyr village are zoned for residential development. The lands are located to the south east of the village centre and front onto the N25. The lands which are approx. 13 ha in area are divided into three separate zonings in the Draft CDP 2021. The northern portion of the lands are zoned for Existing Residential/Mixed Use and are deemed to be susceptible to flood risk (zone A) the middle section of the site is zoned for Medium B Density Residential Development and the southern portion of the site is zoned for agricultural use (CM-AG-02). The submission requests that the Agricultural zoning on the southern portion of the site be revised to residential.</p> <p>The submission refers to the planning history of the site. The most recent application in 2017 for the development of 209 units to include a creche facility, office units and sports pitches was refused permission due to constraints regarding wastewater infrastructure and specifically emission limit levels (Ref: 17/4624, ABP30131618).</p>

	<p>The submission states that all previous refusal reasons on the site can now be satisfactorily addressed and it is the intention to resubmit an application for development on these lands in the near future.</p> <p>The submission is made in the context of the National Planning Framework, the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the East Cork MD LAP 2017. The submission states that Castlemartyr has an important strategic role in delivering population growth in the East Cork Municipal District and that the zoning of the entirety of the proposed lands for residential development would assist in the delivery of the vision for Castlemartyr to achieve a sustainable level of population growth, residential development and provision of employment and services commensurate with the scale of this village.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Castlemartyr? Lands are presently zoned for Agriculture (CM-AG-02) in the Draft Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to include further lands for residential development in the village of Castlemartyr as it is considered that there is sufficient land zoned to accommodate the scale of growth proposed for the village up to 2028. The growth target in Castlemartyr for the Plan period, of 122 units, has been identified by the Core Strategy for the Plan. The Planning Authority considers that the growth target for the village is sufficient.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sonia Ortiz Garcia</b>
<b>DCDP345317715</b>	DCDP345317715
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of MD-R-27 for residential development at Broomfield, Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of Site: The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. The steepness of the site is unsuitable for further development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Impact. The levelling of the site will result in further, massive earthworks over most of the planned 10 years of the extension plan. This will result in 10 years of excessive dust, emissions from construction vehicles, noise pollution and the generation of huge quantities of rubble. In addition, the water run-off from the existing Blossom Hill site has already caused the collapse of the stormwater tanks on the estate, and the development of a much larger site could result in even more serious problems.</li> <li>- Safety Risks. The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</li> <li>- Lack of Privacy / Overlooking Risk. The steepness of the site and the high retaining walls will infringe on the privacy of residents, especially those at the bottom of retaining walls. The construction of homes in this area should thus rather take place on a flatter site.</li> </ul> <p>2) Lack of Adequate Services; The Broomfield neighbourhood lacks adequate services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads. The Broomfield Road is heavily used by both residents and through</li> </ul>



	<p>traffic to the Dungourney Road. In the mornings, traffic backs up from the Avoncore traffic lights up the hill and around the bend well into the Broomfield neighbourhood. Further housing in Broomfield will exacerbate the situation further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social infrastructure. The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds. The area also lacks green areas, shops, community centres and other amenities to support the existing and proposed population. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</li> </ul> <p>3) Existing issues. The submission raises a number of concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stormwater attenuation tank on main green. The ground on the main green subsided in September 2020 due to the collapse of the attenuation tank. No works were carried out on the tank for over nine months, meaning that the green area was off limits and a potential safety hazard. Castle Rock Homes cited COVID as a reason for not carrying out the essential works required on the attenuation tank, though they continued building new houses during Level 5 restrictions.</li> <li>- Lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping. Castle Rock Homes has ceased cutting the grass or maintaining any of the gardens in the estate since mid-2020. The residents have had no option but to do some basic gardening and cutting of lawn despite the estate still being Castle Rock Homes's responsibility. In addition, some of the areas have not been landscaped at all.</li> <li>- Lack of Safety Fences. Several of the retaining walls have no safety barriers despite the significant dangers to residents, and especially children.</li> <li>- Lack of Screening for Privacy. Several gardens are overlooked by roads, but no adequate screening has been provided for privacy.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield (MD-R-27) suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Stuart Campbell</b>
<b>DCDP345349351</b>	DCDP345349351
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to an area of land to the south of Roselawn Estate in Ballinacurra, Midleton. The land lies outside the development boundary of Midleton town and is within the Cork Metropolitan Greenbelt. The

	submission states that this area of land presently acts as a green buffer between existing residential developments to the north and commercial quarrying activity which operates to the south. The submission requests that this area is zoned as Green Infrastructure as it is an extremely vulnerable area and is home to a variety of wildlife.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Midleton to include additional lands for Green Infrastructure in order to protect the residential amenity of Roselawn Housing Estate from adjoining commercial quarrying activity?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not intended to extend the development boundary to the south. Any issues with the Quarry shall be dealt with through the Development Management process within the context of the Metropolitan Green belt policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom and Jacinta Clancy</b>
<b>DCDP346138760</b>	DCDP346138760
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the development boundary of Ballycotton be extended to include 9.87 ha of land to the south. The lands are contiguous to the development boundary and are part of the rural housing policy area 'Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence'. The submission also proposes that an objective is included in the Development Plan to provide a relief/distributor road through Ballycotton to unlock land for development.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Ballycotton to include additional lands for development and to provide for a relief/distributor road through Ballycotton?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Core Strategy allocates up to 45 houses to the settlement of Ballycotton during the plan period. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for residential development in Ballycotton to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan. See Volume 4, Chapter 3, Section 3.12, Objective DB-01 Ballycotton.  There is no proposal by the Roads Authority to advance such improvements. It is envisaged that any such improvements as may be required would be developer led and funded.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom and Jacinta Clancy</b>
<b>DCDP346139817</b>	DCDP346139817
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that 6.8Ha of land is included within the development boundary of Shanagarry for residential development. The lands are located to the south of Shanagarry just outside the development boundary. The lands form part of the Rural Housing Control Zone 'Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence'.  The submission states that the removal of the development boundary from

	village nuclei as part of an adjustment to the settlement network places a greater importance on villages to cater for housing need and the local authority should be encouraging housing growth to villages such as Shanagarry.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Shanagarry to include additional lands for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The growth target in Shanagarry/Garryvoe for the Plan period is 70 units and the Planning Authority is satisfied that there is already a very generous supply of land within the current boundary to cater for such growth. Further extending the boundary would militate against compact growth. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom Barry</b>
<b>DCDP345528647</b>	DCDP345528647
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that two parcels of land in the village of Ladysbridge be zoned for development.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to extend the development boundary of Ladysbridge to include land for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	No residential lands are being zoned in the villages. It is considered that there is enough land available inside the existing development boundary to allow for the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period as set out in Objective DB-01 for Ladysbridge. No change proposed
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Is it appropriate to extend the development boundary of Ladysbridge to include land for residential development?
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tom O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP346231764</b>	DCDP346231764
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission requests that the Ladysbridge development boundary is extended further to the west. The proposed extension is contiguous to the existing built-up area and is located in the rural housing policy area 'Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence'. The submission proposes a 40 unit development on the lands. The submission states that the village can only extend to the west due to constraints associated with flooding and architectural issues.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to extend the development boundary of Ladysbridge to include land for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	No residential lands are being zoned in the villages. It is considered that there is enough land available inside the existing development boundary to allow for the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period as set out in Objective DB-01 for Ladysbridge. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Valeria Felice</b>

<b>DCDP345667609</b>	DCDP345667609
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the zoning of further lands for residential development at Broomfield in Midleton for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Unsuitability of the Site; The proposed site is located on a steep hill above the existing Blossom Hill site. New development will overlook existing properties. The development of the site will result in destruction of the hill side over the next 10 years resulting in scarring of the landscape, excessive dust emissions and noise pollution.</p> <p>2) Safety Risks; The levelling of the site will result in the construction of high retaining walls similar to those already constructed in Blossom Hill. These pose a safety risk to residents, especially to children.</p> <p>3) Lack of adequate infrastructure including roads, parking and waste water capacity.</p> <p>4) Lack of social infrastructure; The submission states that there are no adequate leisure facilities in Broomfield such as playgrounds and green areas. Midleton also has a shortage of creche places, primary schools and secondary schools. The submission states that additional residential development will put even more pressure on the existing facilities in the area.</p> <p>5) Existing issues. The submission raises concerns in relation to Broomfield Village and suggests that there are a number of matters outstanding including the collapse of Stormwater attenuation tank on main green and lack of Grounds Maintenance / landscaping.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No. 4.3.3.15
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Veronica Scannell</b>
<b>DCDP339246587</b>	DCDP339246587 (Two Part Sub with DCDP339209064)
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to the settlement of Guileen/Gyleen in East Cork. The submission is in 2 parts and includes photographs of a number of buildings/structures in the settlement including the Coastguard station, slipway and thatched cottages. The submission states that there is no mention of Guileen as a whole in the plan apart from the recognition of the Thatched cottages and the Coastguard station as protected structures. The</p>

	submission concludes that it is vital to preserve the character of Guileen and to retain its traditional style.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to further recognise Gyleen in the County Development Plan and in particular to recognise the importance of a number of buildings/protected structures in the settlement and its traditional style and character?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Gyleen is no longer designated as an 'Other Location'. All protected structures in the village are recognised in Volume 2 Heritage and Amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Veronica Scannell</b>
<b>DCDP339209064</b>	DCDP339209064 (Two Part Sub with DCDP339246587)
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to the settlement of Guileen/Gyleen in East Cork. The submission is in 2 parts and includes photographs of a number of buildings/structures in the settlement including the Coastguard station, slipway and thatched cottages. The submission states that there is no mention of Guileen as a whole in the plan apart from the recognition of the Thatched cottages and the Coastguard station as protected structures. The submission concludes that it is vital to preserve the character of Guileen and to retain its traditional style.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to further recognise Gyleen in the County Development Plan and in particular to recognise the importance of a number of buildings/protected structures in the settlement and its traditional style and character?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Gyleen is no longer designated as an 'Other Location'. All protected structures in the village are recognised in Volume 2 Heritage and Amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>View Field (Investments) Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346133631</b>	DCDP346133631
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that lands at Whitegate be zoned for a small-scale residential development. The lands are zoned as Green Infrastructure (GR-02) in the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2021 and are recognised as being suitable for a public park or playground. The site is currently zoned as open space within the current East Cork Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the lands are suitable for a small-scale infill residential development and that the site is rezoned as Existing Residential/ Mixed Residential and Other Uses. The submission states that the site is not currently used as an open space and is not publicly accessible.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Should lands at Whitegate which are presently zoned GR-02 be zoned for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there is sufficient land available for residential development in Whitegate/Aghada to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>William Bulman</b>
<b>DCDP345322647</b>	DCDP345322647
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission objects to any additional zoning at Broomfield Village which would damage the natural environment currently used by walkers. The submission also states that the development would have an environmental impact due to the increase in the number of cars on a substandard road and the negative visual impact of the development when viewed from the town.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Are proposed residential lands at Broomfield suitable for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The MD R-27 lands have been reclassified as residential reserve. As detailed Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan, consideration may be given to the development of some residential reserve lands before the end of the plan period subject to certain conditions being met.  It is proposed to amend the Draft Plan to provide further clarity in relation to residential reserve lands. See Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2 and Chapter 18.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Text and Map Amendment Required. See Amendment No.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>William Ellis</b>
<b>DCDP345933585</b>	DCDP345933585
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that lands at Muckridge in Youghal be zoned for residential development to allow for a small cluster of detached houses. The lands are currently zoned for Green Infrastructure in the Draft CDP (YL-GC-01).
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Would it be appropriate to change the zoning of part of YL-GC-01 in Youghal to residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient land available for residential development in Youghal to meet the growth target identified for the village in the Core Strategy of the Plan. These lands are the north west periphery of the town and would not support sequential or compact growth. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Youghal Chamber</b>
<b>DCDP346294123</b>	DCDP346294123
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission from Youghal Chamber of Tourism and Commerce sets out a number of proposals and concerns for the future needs of Youghal Town as follows; 1. The preparation of a Beach Study to analyse the strengths and short comings of Youghals finest asset to include connectivity to the Greenway and the town and the provision of a playground. 2. The Preparation of a regeneration Scheme for South Main Street including residential led regeneration.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Upgrade and promotion of the Slob Bank Walk including improving the footing, entrance and safety along the length of the bank and extending the walk.</li> <li>4. Completion of the Sean McLoughlan adopted Public Realm Plan for the Town Centre.</li> <li>5. Concerns at the designation of the Brownfield Site at Cork Hill as suitable for Regeneration. This is part of the curtilage of Myrtle Grove – a national monument of international importance.</li> <li>6. Concern at the lack of Tier 1 Industrial Land zoned in the Town.</li> <li>7. Support the by-passing of Killeagh and Castlemartyr and the upgrading of the Cork Midleton Road.</li> <li>8. Support Youghal Greyhound Stadium.</li> <li>9. Support the re-opening of Youghal – Gortroe - Killeagh – Mogelly – Kilmountain - Midleton Railway.</li> <li>10. Support the termination of Waste Management – Hazardous and Non-Hazardous – within the Foxhole Area of Youghal – Proximity Rules Apply</li> <li>11. There are a number of enhancements needed for Youghal to improve the sustainability, safety and connectivity of the local residents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Footpath from Cock and the Bull to Keane Park</li> <li>b. Allens Quay Walkway (The Mystery Pole)</li> </ol> </li> <li>12. The current Water Supply System does not come up to code nor do we have sufficient capacity. The consequential discharge of treated water into the ground must be urgently addressed to comply with the EU Water Framework Directive</li> <li>13. Support for Marine Tourism in the town and in particular an objective towards the provision of a Marina in the Town Centre</li> <li>14. The old community hall needs to be renovated and refurbished, providing a space to host social events, and to provide youth activities etc.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Principle Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The preparation of a Beach Study to include connectivity to the Greenway and a playground.</li> <li>2. The Preparation of a regeneration Scheme for South Main Street including residential led regeneration.</li> <li>3. Upgrade and promotion of the Slob Bank Walk</li> <li>4. Completion of the Sean McLoughlan adopted Public Realm Plan for the Town Centre.</li> <li>5. Concerns at the designation of the Brownfield Site at Cork Hill as suitable for Regeneration.</li> <li>6. Concern at the lack of Tier 1 Industrial Land zoned in the Town.</li> <li>7. Support the by-passing of Killeagh and Castlemartyr and the upgrading of the Cork Midleton Road.</li> <li>8. Support Youghal Greyhound Stadium.</li> <li>9. Support the re-opening of Railway.</li> <li>10. Support the termination of Waste Management – Hazardous and Non-Hazardous – within the Foxhole Area of Youghal</li> <li>11. Enhancements needed for Youghal to improve the sustainability, safety and connectivity of the local residents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Footpath from Cock and the Bull to Keane Park</li> <li>b. Allens Quay Walkway (The Mystery Pole)</li> </ol> </li> <li>12. Water Supply System does not have sufficient capacity.</li> <li>13. Support for Marine Tourism</li> </ol>



	14. Renovation of the old community hall.
Chief Executive's Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a) Cork County Council Tourism Department has made substantial progress on a number of tourism initiatives including the redevelopment of beach amenities including the launch of the Youghal Boardwalk Project which was opened in June 2021. This phase saw an extension of the existing boardwalk from Claycastle beach out to Redbarn beach, both of which were awarded the prestigious Blue Flag for 2021, significantly enhancing the 'beach experience' for visitors. b) The Planning Authority has committed to a review of its Recreation and Amenity policy to replace the current Interim Policy within the lifetime of the Plan. See Paragraph 14.5.5. The need for additional recreational facilities in Youghal, including playgrounds, will be reviewed in the preparation of this policy. c) Objective YLGO-09 supports the improvement of beach areas including the adequate provision of toilet, shower and changing facilities as well as services such as play areas.</li> <li>2. Objective YL-GO-09 in the plan supports appropriate heritage led town centre renewal and continuing public realm improvements in the town.</li> <li>3. YL-GO-10 in the plan supports the improvement and enhancement of pedestrian and cycling connectivity through the town.</li> <li>4. The public realm plan for Youghal is continuing to be implemented in the town. General Objective YL-GO-08 sets out a requirement to protect and enhance the attractive landscape character setting of the town including the development of regeneration areas and public realm improvements.</li> <li>5. The curtilage of Myrtle Grove which is a protected structure will be taken into consideration in any redevelopment of the identified disused brownfield site at Cork Hill (YL-RA-07).</li> <li>6. There are two sites zoned for industrial development in the town and four sites zoned for Business and General Employment use. These lands are all available for employment use subject to normal proper planning considerations.</li> <li>7. The provision of a bypass for Castlemartyr and Killeagh is supported in this plan. See objectives CM-U-01 for Castlemartyr and U-03 for Killeagh in Volume 4, Chapter 3.</li> <li>8. Noted. Site has retained zoning for Greyhound Track. See objective YL-GR-15 in the plan.</li> <li>9. There are no current plans to reopen the railway line from Midleton to Youghal.</li> <li>10. This is considered to be Development Management Issue.</li> <li>11. YL-G-10 in the plan supports the improvement and enhancement of pedestrian and cycling connectivity throughout the town and especially from new development areas to the schools, shops and local services.</li> <li>12. Operations for improving capacity of the Water Supply System in Youghal are currently being reviewed. See para. 3.4.56 in the Draft Plan.</li> </ol>

	<p>13. Marine Tourism in the town is supported in the plan and support for Marine Tourism in general is supported in Chapter 7 (Marine, Coastal and Islands and Chapter 10 Tourism).</p> <p>14. The planning authority supports the renovation and reuse of existing derelict or disused buildings.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Youghal Chamber of Tourism and Commerce</b>
<b>DCDP345976514</b>	DCDP345976514
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands to the south of the Old Bridge Road / Slip Road servicing the Youghal Civic Amenity Site which are zoned Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The submission recommends including an objective for the lands to include the following wording; 'to promote the development of these industrial areas as the primary locations for uses including manufacturing, repairs, warehousing and distribution, whereas the development of inappropriate uses such the treatment of Hazardous and Non Hazardous Waste is not permitted'.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is an objective needed for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses lands at Foxhole in Youghal which includes the following wording 'to promote the development of these industrial areas as the primary locations for uses including manufacturing, repairs, warehousing and distribution, whereas the development of inappropriate uses such the treatment of Hazardous and Non Hazardous Waste is not permitted'.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The appropriate uses allowed in areas zoned for Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses is included in Volume 1, Chapter 18 Zoning and Land Use. An objective relating directly to existing uses is not required and any proposed development on the site will be assessed at the planning application stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Youghal Chamber of Tourism and Commerce</b>
<b>DCDP346278000</b>	DCDP346278000
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission includes a breakdown of the Youghal Future Needs Online Opinion Poll conducted by Youghal Chamber of Tourism and Commerce. The Poll highlights the various deficiencies to the Youghal Area, which include the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The need to encourage Industry to locate in Youghal. There is a need to market the town to potential employers. Increased focus is needed on targeting smaller Foreign Direct Investment Companies through the IDA's Emerging Businesses Division.</li> <li>2) Need for new beach facilities including toilets, showers, water sports facilities, lighting on the boardwalk and triathlon facilities.</li> <li>3) The urgent need for a by-pass for Killeagh and Castlemartyr.</li> <li>4) The need for a primary health centre in Youghal.</li> </ol>

	<p>5) The need for more higher-level education facilities in the town to expand and develop Colaiste Eoin's existing Adult Education Services.</p> <p>6) The need for the provision of toilet facilities in the town centre.</p> <p>7) The need for a full time garda station similar to the service provided in Kinsale.</p> <p>8) To establish Youghal as a 1GB Broadband Hub.</p> <p>9) Expansion of the public library.</p> <p>10) Designated camper van/mobile homes sites on Council land near Aura leisure centre.</p> <p>11) Re-location of Cork County Council offices and other Government jobs to Youghal.</p> <p>13) Re-open the rail line to Youghal. 24% of Youghal households do not own a car so public transport is important.</p> <p>14) Stronger employment sector is needed to support the retail function of the town.</p> <p>15) The town needs a marina and sailing facilities.</p>
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	<p>1) Is there a need to encourage industry to locate in Youghal?</p> <p>2) Is there a need for new beach facilities in the town including toilets?</p> <p>3) Is there a need for a by-pass for Killeagh and Castlemartyr?</p> <p>4) Is there a need for a primary health centre in Youghal?</p> <p>5) Is there a need for more higher-level education facilities in Youghal?</p> <p>6) Is there a need for more toilet facilities in the town centre?</p> <p>7) Is there a need for a full time garda station?</p> <p>8) Should Youghal be established as a 1GB Hub?</p> <p>9) Should the public library be expanded in the town?</p> <p>10) Should there be a designated camper van/mobile home site on Council land near the Aura Leisure Centre?</p> <p>11) Should Cork County Council offices be relocated to Youghal?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. The plan acknowledges the need to attract additional employment to the town. See paragraphs 3.4.35 to 3.4.42 in the Draft Plan. Approximately 57 ha of land is zoned for employment related development in Youghal. Continued improvements to public realm in the town will help to restore business confidence in the town as a whole. Objective YL-GO-07 supports and promotes Youghal as a sustainable employment centre.</p> <p>2. Objective YLGO-09 supports the improvement of beach areas including the adequate provision of toilet, shower and changing facilities as well as services such as play areas.</p> <p>3. The provision of a bypass for Castlemartyr and Killeagh is supported in this plan. See objectives CM-U-01 for Castlemartyr and U-03 for Killeagh in Volume 4, Chapter 3.</p> <p>4. There is a community hospital in the town and a HSE health centre at Foxhole. The provision of a primary health care centre is a matter for the Development Management Process. The Plan supports the provision of primary care centres in appropriate locations across the County. See Objective SC 6-8.</p> <p>5. There is a VEC Further Education Facility in Youghal. The provision of further facilities is an issue for the Department of Education.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Objective YLGO-09 supports the improvement of beach areas including the adequate provision of toilet, shower and changing facilities as well as services such as play areas.</li> <li>7. The provision or need for a Garda Station is outside the remit of the County Development Plan process.</li> <li>8. Designating Youghal as a 1GB town is outside the remit of the Development Plan.</li> <li>9. The expansion of the public library in the town is a matter which can be dealt with through the Development Management Process.</li> <li>10. No submission has been received in relation to the zoning of lands for a caravan park in Claycastle. These lands are currently zoned YL-GC-19. This zone supports habitats of ecological value.</li> <li>11. The East Cork MD offices are located in Midleton and Youghal.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Youghal Family Resource Centre, Cumann na Daoine, Youghal Community Health Project</b>
<b>DCDP344278502</b>	DCDP344278502
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission recommends that the Cork county development plan includes, as a priority for Youghal (urban and rural), support to provide a premises for Youghal Family Resource Centre (FRC) to support the delivery of community childcare, including afterschool care, parenting hub and drop-in supports for children and their families. Youghal does not currently have an FRC and given Youghal's population size which is expected to increase, unemployment rate, number of lone parent families (compared to the national average) and deprivation score the submission states that the absence of a family resource centre is a significant omission.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the CDP include support to provide a premises for Youghal Family Resource Centre to support the delivery of community childcare including afterschool care, parenting hub and drop in supports.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The provision of a premises for the proposed development could be considered through the Development Management Process.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>YOUGHAL RIFLE RANGE Ltd. - Seamus &amp; Eileen Lantry</b>
<b>DCDP345785588</b>	DCDP345785588
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission proposes that the coastal areas of Summerfield, Redbarn and Clonard townlands near Youghal Bay be zoned for Tourism related activities on a strip of land 480m wide along the seafront of Youghal Bay.
<b>Principle Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to zone coastal areas of Summerfield, Redbarn and Clonard near Youghal Bay for Tourism related activities?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The townlands of Claycastle, Summerfield, Redbarn, Clonard and Pilmore occupy a large stretch of sensitive coastline where it is necessary balance competing demands for development with the protection of the environment. Volume One of the Development Plan sets out settlement strategy of the Planning Authority and the approach to development</li> </ol>

	<p>generally across the settlement network of the county and in rural areas. Chapter 10 of the Plan details policies specifically in relation to the tourism. Chapter 7 deals with Marine, Coastal and Island Areas, while Chapter 15 deals with Biodiversity and Environment. The Tourism Chapter of the plan seeks to promote a sustainable and well managed tourism industry which protects the environment and heritage assets of the county. Tourism is encouraged throughout the county and many coastal towns and villages have a significant tourism role already.</p> <p>The policies of the draft plan are considered appropriate and sufficient in this regard. No change proposed.</p> <p>Maintenance of drainage systems is a matter for the OPW and is beyond the scope of the Plan.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No Amendment Required.

## Volume Four -South Cork – Macroom Municipal District

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Alan &amp; Pamela Lehane</b>
<b>DCDP334064990</b>	DCDP334064990
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests an extension of the Development Boundary of Ballinagree.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the CDP include Ballinagree and amend its development boundary?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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 <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bellmount Developments Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344471894</b>	DCDP344471894
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission from Bellmount Developments Limited requests the extension of the development boundary of Crookstown to include additional lands at Bellmount Lower, south of the Mills Commercial Park. Submission indicates that the lands would be used for expanding the Mills Commercial Park in the future and would support the development of the village. Submitter proposes to convert the existing mill building into a distillery and will need additional lands to facilitate the storage/maturation process. The submission references the settlement and economic / employment policies from the County Development Plan 2014 and the Draft County Development Plan 2021 in support of the submission, both of which support the economic development of settlements and rural areas. The site provides good access for heavy goods vehicles to the National Road network, is accessible from the regional road, R585 which connects directly to the N22 Cork-Kerry Road just over 1 km away. The lands are within 1km of a public transport facility, are not situated near any sites of environmental / natural interest or scenic routes / landscape areas and are not susceptible to flooding.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the development boundary of Crookstown be extended to include additional lands south east of Bellmount Mills?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that opportunities for development / redevelopment within the existing site of the Mills Commercial Park should be optimised before the boundary is extended. While

	the site for inclusion within the boundary is not at risk of flooding, large parts of the village, and the public roads serving same, are identified as being at risk of flooding. The Commercial Park includes Bellmount Mills, a protected structure and recorded monument which is in very poor condition.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brenda O'Driscoll</b>
<b>DCDP346124187</b>	DCDP346124187
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission concerns 7.9ha lands within the greenbelt, contiguous to the eastern development boundary of Killumney Ovens. The land is south of the N40 and straddles the link road connecting Killumney Ovens to the N22 Ovens interchange. Submission requests that the land be included within the development boundary of Killumney Ovens and zoned as "Business and General Employment". The land is adjacent to EMC and a new housing development currently under construction. Submission notes that the area has benefited from a significant level of investment in public services infrastructure and public transport and is planned to benefit from significant future investment with the development of the light rail system (lands are at the proposed terminus of the route). Public water supply is available and the Killumney / Ovens WWTP is due an upgrade under Irish Water's Small Towns and Villages Growth Programme -ranked No 1 on the list. Excellent vehicular and pedestrian connectivity is available.</p> <p>Submission references national, regional and local planning policy in support of the submission. It is considered that the provision of additional employment lands in Killumney should be considered in the wider context which includes Ballincollig and the presence of EMC. The current green belt zoning is considered at odds with this existing built up area and pattern of development in the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the development boundary of Killumney Ovens be extended to include additional lands for business and general employment use?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. These lands are located south of the N22 and the N22 Junction 3 Ballincollig West Interchange serving Killumney. The site straddles the link road connecting the interchange to the local Killumney road. The lands are in the greenbelt.</p> <p>As outlined in Chapter 8 Economic Development, the Planning Authority will complete a review of the employment land supply across the county as a whole within two years of the adoption of the plan and the need for additional employment lands at Killumney will be considered as part of that process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>C &amp; J Developments Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346225540</b>	DCDP346225540



<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the proposed draft plan development boundary for Aherla is retained and extended to the north and south east. The submission states that the C&J Developments who own the proposed lands currently maintain the existing sewerage system which serves the village and that as this system needs upgrading. It also states that C&J Developments are prepared to invest in the capital costs for the provision of this new sewage system and that discussions are taking place with both Irish water and the Council in this regard. The submission notes that the area is under pressure from one off housing and that there are good community facilities and services in the village.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the existing development areas within the development boundary of Aherla be retained? Can the development boundary be further extended?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. This amended CDP makes provision for 10 units within the development boundary of Aherla. It is considered that there is ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary at this time. <i>See Volume One, of this report.</i>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Carmel Healy</b>
<b>DCDP346218246</b>	DCDP346218246
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the development boundary at Ballymakeera be extended to include one residential area to the east, arguing that the realignment of the development boundary will allow for one extra house in this area as one old derelict dwelling house is to be demolished and rebuilt, also noting that there is safe entrance and access onto the public road. The submission notes that the public sewer was recently upgraded in Ballymakeera and that the settlement which is a key village with a wide range of amenities and community facilities is to be by-passed which will dramatically reduce traffic on the road.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the development boundary be realigned to include one site to the east of the village?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Yes, it is considered reasonable to include this site, there is already a property located on this site and it is not located within a flood risk zone.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. See Proposed Amendment 4.4.8.6
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Caroline Crowley</b>
<b>DCDP346172957</b>	DCDP346172957
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands approximately 10.16 Ha (25 acres) located just west of, and adjacent to the new City boundary and to the

	<p>North of the defined settlement of Killumney and Ovens at Curraghbeg, which are currently designated as Prominent and Strategic Greenbelt be zoned as existing mixed / general business / industrial uses consisting of a mix of employment uses generally including long term establishments. The submission outlines the current built development on the site and notes the previous planning history of the site.</p> <p>The submission also notes that according to data provided by Savills regarding the limited supply of industrial stock in the pipeline that there is market demand for new locations to be identified suitable for industrial, manufacturing and life science uses. The submission argues that these lands should also be afforded at the very least the appropriate policy support in the upcoming Development Plan to ensure their continued successful operation.</p> <p>In addition, the submission also requests that the omitted portion of lands north of the N22 from the current settlement boundary, should be afforded the proposed new ZU 18-9: Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses zoning objective to allow for their orderly future development and also to reflect their existing residential and amenity uses.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the development boundary of Killumney Ovens be extended to the northern side of the N22 and include 10.16 Ha be zoned as existing mixed / general business / industrial uses consisting of a mix of employment uses generally including long term establishments?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During the preparation of the draft plan, the decision was taken to remove a small area of established uses and with a recent permission for 9 houses. It was a genuine attempt to consolidate the settlement, and recognise that the settlement of Killumney Ovens, which is already the subject of much discussion regarding the proposed N22 which bisects the two locations is not intended to grow in a northerly direction as a suburb of Ballincollig. It was for this reason and the fact that there are ample more suitable lands that can promote better compact development opportunities south of the N22 that have lead to this decision. While it is acknowledged that there are existing uses in this area these will continue in accordance with their current permissions but it would not be in the long term interest of this area to promote it for further development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Church Street Residents Association</b>
<b>DCDP346275948</b>	DCDP346275948
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission outlines specific requirements and commentary on the content of the Millstreet Plan with suggested amendments ranging from typos, suggested rewrites, to policy amendments and changes to zoning objectives proposed and in particular the submission strongly disagrees with specific objectives MS-U-01 and MS-U-04 in the Millstreet Plan. The submission welcomes the Plan and the Policy Objectives overall, however, the submission does not believe that the Policy Objectives in</p>

	<p>Volume One, particular regarding Chapter 3 (Settlements and Placemaking); Chapter 9 (Town Centres and Retail); Chapter 11 (Water Management); Chapter 14 (Green Infrastructure); Chapter 15 (Biodiversity and Environment); and Chapter 18 (Zoning and Land Use) have been adequately applied to the Millstreet Plan.</p> <p>The submission requests that an additional pedestrian crossing at the busy junction between Church Street and Minor Row where pedestrians regularly cross should be included and that traffic calming solutions to traffic as it approaches from Macroom and Killarney / Mallow should be examined.</p> <p>The submission notes that Millstreet library is located in a building of historical importance near the national and secondary schools and should be preserved, expanded and adequately funded, in order to support the growing population and schools.</p> <p>The submission comment that Noel C Duggan Engineering Limited is a small employer in that its most recent accounts showed that it had on average 38 employees, the same as O’Keefe’s Super Valu in Millstreet. The submission submits that this sentence should be amended or O’Keefe’s Super Valu and other similar size enterprises be given the same recognition / significance. The submission also notes that future employment type development should be encouraged to take place in the existing industrial estate or outside the town centre generally, so as to align with the Settlements and Placemaking policy objectives, and also to reduce town centre traffic and encourage residential uptake in the town centre.</p> <p>The submission notes that a large privately owned country park was developed to the South East of Millstreet and was a popular local and tourist destination for a number of years however, due to lack of funding, it was closed in 2017, however the submission proposes that the site has potential to be developed as a future tourist amenity, biodiversity location or special area of conservation, given adequate funding.</p> <p>The submission suggests that water conservation measures in the future should protect existing capacity and adequately protect biodiversity within the Blackwater SAC.</p> <p>The submission requests that any development proposals in the vicinity of Mount Leader House area will require special consideration to ensure its history and setting is maintained.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the habitats of ecological value (Table 4.4.10) are given greater protection so that future development proposals will need to avoid any potential impacts on these sites.</p> <p>The submission requests that MS GO 01 regarding the overall growth for Millstreet is amended to include the text 'while remaining mindful of the overall policy objectives in Volume One and Two.</p> <p>The submission requests that MS GO 02 regarding Waste water infrastructure is amended to include ' and the conditions associated with any grant of planning of such developments must provide for same.'</p> <p>In relation to MS-B-03, the submission states that town centre traffic is severely impacted at present due to activities at this site, as are local residents by the noise and that future expansion of current industrial uses should be avoided and all future industrial zoning and development located outside the town centre footprint.</p>
--	---

	<p>In relation to MS-C-04 the submission requests that the following is added: 'Proposals should make provision for the protection of the broadleaved woodland on the boundary of the site because of its ecological and visual value.'</p> <p>The submission strongly disagrees with the location of the proposed relief road MS-U-01 due to its close proximity to terraced houses on Church Street and argues that these houses are terraced without land barriers / gardens between them and the road, the proposed relief road will lead to increased noise for residents who are already severely impacted by a poorly zoned industrial steel manufacturer to the rear of their houses. The submission also notes that the relief road raises safety issues for several families with young children living in terraced houses along Church Street and that the residents of St. Joseph's gardens will also be impacted by increased traffic volumes leading to noise and safety concerns; and that the Finnow River Basin (which is a tributary of the Blackwater special area of conservation) and its associated wildlife, will be impacted by the location of this proposed relief road. The submission states that the location of the proposed relief road be amended so that it runs North of the town, maintaining more or less its current proposed junction with the N72 west of town, but re-joining the N72 nearer to MS-GB-03; or alternatively, runs North of the town, maintaining more or less its current proposed junction with the N72 west of town, but re-joining the N72 nearer to MS-GB-02, while avoiding the Tanyard Stream, MS-GC-04. The submission notes that these alternatives mean that impact of the relief road will be limited to those residential areas that are less built up, and to business zones (i.e. M-BS-02) and that such an amended location would also provide greater relief to traffic to the Green Glens arena for future large live events.</p> <p>Finally, the submission also strongly disagrees with any proposals for future zoning or development of MS-U-04 as industrial, utilities or business as there are approximately 18 residential developments along Church Street, which run adjacent to this site, whose gardens overlook it. The submission outlines in detail the negative impact this would have on the neighbouring residents and proposes that any further development of this site, apart from low-density residential, green infrastructure, agriculture or low-impact community development, is to be strongly discouraged and that any future zoning or development of this site should align with the overall objectives of this Plan.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the plan promote and suggest additional pedestrian crossings and traffic calming solutions on the approaches to the town from Macroom and Killarney / Mallow?</li> <li>2. Can Millstreet library be preserved, expanded and adequately funded, in order to support the growing population and schools.</li> <li>3. Can further detail be provided regarding other employers in the town?</li> <li>4. Given that this use has been established on these lands it is considered that given the financial resources that it can reopen as a future tourist amenity, biodiversity location or special area of conservation in accordance with its original permission and in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Yes, there are many wide ranging policies and objectives which specifically related to the protection of biodiversity within the Blackwater SAC.</li> <li>6. Will water conservation measures protect the existing capacity and adequately protect biodiversity within the Blackwater SAC.</li> <li>7. Can future development proposals in the vicinity of Mount Leader House area require special consideration to ensure its history and setting is maintained?</li> <li>8. Should MS GO 01 be amended to include the text 'while remaining mindful of the overall policy objectives in Volume One and Two'?</li> <li>9. Should MS GO 02 regarding Wastewater infrastructure be amended to include 'and the conditions associated with any grant of planning of such developments must provide for same.'</li> <li>10. Should future employment lands be located outside of the built footprint of the settlement?</li> <li>11. Should MS-C-04 be amended to include the text 'Proposals should make provision for the protection of the broadleaved woodland on the boundary of the site because of its ecological and visual value.'</li> <li>12. Should the location of the proposed relief road MS-U-01 be reviewed?</li> <li>13. Is there a requirement for MS-U-04 for a car park?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the plan can include a comment on the improvement of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming solutions on the approaches to the town from Macroom and Killarney / Mallow?</li> <li>2. The expansion of the library service is outside of the scope of the Development Plan.</li> <li>3. It is considered that paragraph 4.4.16 of the plan provides a balanced approach to the range and types of employment in the town including the retail and services sector which provides significant employment as outlined in the submission.</li> <li>4. Can the plan identify lands outside of the town as a future tourist amenity, biodiversity location or special area of conservation?</li> <li>5. Given that this use has been established on these lands it is considered that given the financial resources that it can reopen as a future tourist amenity, biodiversity location or special area of conservation in accordance with its original permission and in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</li> <li>6. Yes, there are many wide-ranging policies and objectives which specifically related to the protection of biodiversity within the Blackwater SAC.</li> <li>7. Given that Mount Leader House is a protected structure (RPS 324) any development proposals in its curtilage require special consideration to ensure its history and setting is maintained?</li> <li>8. It is considered that because all the policies and objectives of volumes 1 and 2 and MS GO 01 all form part of the same plan, that there is no need or requirement to make specific mention of the policies in Volume 1 and 2.</li> <li>9. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to include this sentence, as all development proposals contain conditions</li> </ol>

	<p>regarding Wastewater infrastructure where required in accordance with the Development Management Guidelines and the policies and objectives of the CDP.</p> <p>10. It is proposed that within 2 years of the adoption of the plan a full assessment of the employment land will be undertaken which will determine the needs of each settlement.</p> <p>11. It would seem that there are no broadleaved woodland on the boundary of MS-C-04, this objective relates to MS-C-02.</p> <p>12. Following an internal review of the requirement of the proposed relief road MS-U-01 it has been requested to remove it from the plan.</p> <p>13. Following a review of the recent existing permission on this site it is proposed to remove the MS-U-04 objective for a car park.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See Amendment No 4.4.4.14</li> <li>2. No amendment required</li> <li>3. No amendment required</li> <li>4. No amendment required</li> <li>5. No amendment required</li> <li>6. No amendment required</li> <li>7. No amendment required</li> <li>8. No amendment required</li> <li>9. No amendment required</li> <li>10. No amendment required</li> <li>11. No amendment required</li> <li>12. See Amendment No 4.4.4.12</li> <li>13. See Amendment No 4.4.4.15</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Classes Land Ltd/O'Callaghan Properties</b>
<b>DCDP345361901</b>	DCDP345361901
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the County Council revisit the core housing strategy and in particular the unit numbers for Cloghduv, arguing that it is capable of supporting an increased number of housing units with serviced, accessible and deliverable land over the Development Plan period. The submission notes that in doing so, that it will create a robust and sustainable assessment of housing capacity in rural settlements which is reflected in the core strategy and that this will also allow growth to be concentrated in the settlements that have the most potential to accommodate that growth.</p> <p>This submission relates specifically to the property interests of O'Callaghan Properties (OCP) who the submission states are actively developing new homes within Cloghduv, noting that this also signals this developers commitment to the sustainable development of the village.</p> <p>The submission outlines in some detail the developers planning history in the village and argues that OCP have invested significantly in infrastructure to serve Cloghduv and surrounding areas. The submission argues that the frontloading of infrastructure to service the permitted schemes and to address deficiencies in the networks resulted in OCP entering into a Public Private Partnership (PPP) with Cork County Council for the upgrading of</p>

	<p>the water and wastewater services.</p> <p>The submission notes that the policies of the NPF were not carried through to the distribution of units in the core strategy of the Draft Cork County Development Plan as it is not at all clear how these figures were arrived at as there is no outlined strategy or clear justification and that local circumstances pertaining to individual village settlements must be considered when determining the allocation of housing units. In this regard, the submission recommends that Cork County Council in their consideration of unit allocation amongst settlements should refer to the 2007 Development Plan Guidelines and provides an assessment of Cloghduv in further support of an increased overall scale of development figure for the settlement.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the housing unit allocation for Cloghduv be increased?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In keeping with the many changes to government policy in recent years, the housing allocation for Cork County for the period to 2028 is significantly less than that outlined in current plans. This has necessitated a review of growth levels across the settlement network in line with national policy on compact employment led growth, regeneration of towns and villages etc. The scale of growth allocated to Cloghduv is considered appropriate in this context. As part of the Active Land Management process, development in villages will be monitored over the life of the plan and consideration can be given to reallocation of growth as appropriate.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Codrum Holdings</b>
<b>DCDP346222402</b>	DCDP346222402
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes an extension of the development boundary by about 6.5 Ha at Codrum, Macroom to the west of the town. The submission sets out a wide range of reasons for this proposal including the servicing benefits associated with the site, its natural fall (no pumping required), no overlooking, all houses can face south, existing mature boundary landscaping on site, footpaths (from two roads), that it is within close proximity to all community facilities and services, and surrounded by residential development.</p> <p>The submission also notes that the sewer services come to within 280 m of the site and that the public sewer is to be further upgraded in 2024, that the new Macroom by-pass will result in the Killarney Road being reduced to a secondary road, and that this stretch of road allows for the creation of a safe access to the site. The submission states that the Sullane River is on the opposite side of the public roadway which would allow for surface water discharge and that the ground conditions suitable for standard foundation construction allow for environmentally efficient construction.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan altogether makes provision for 487 units in Macroom and 15 ha of land have been zoned to cater for this. In addition, there</li> </ol>



	are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint. There is sufficient land zoned in Macroom to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such consolidated development and in accordance with National Policy and Guidelines. See Volume One of this report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Coiste Forbartha Béal Átha'n Ghaorthaidh</b>
<b>DCDP345886155</b>	DCDP345886155
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission is from Coiste Forbartha Béal Átha'n Ghaorthaidh, the community-based 'Ballingeary Development Committee', which aims to promote and develop social, environmental and economic opportunities for the benefit of all aspects of life in the area. Firstly, the submission supports the vision in the plan for Béal Átha'n Ghaorthaidh noting that a number of community-driven projects and initiatives are under way at present or planned but the rate of progress depends on funding. Regarding the development within the development boundary, it is noted that there a number of disused properties within the village and in the immediate area which could be brought back into residential use and the submission states that the Coiste is interested (subject to funding) to adopt and manage a number of properties in order to offer short and medium rental opportunities for individuals and their families who might wish to relocate and possibly avail of the digital hub at the GTEIC, which is already in operation. The submission notes that the lands close to the village centre are not available for sale. The submission notes that the absence of an adequate wastewater treatment plant is a blight on the social and economic development of the village as well as presenting a public health risk to the lands in the vicinity, the GAA, and the potential wild life reserve. The submission also notes that as a result of the CFAMs study, the OPW proposed a hard engineering (walls) solution to flooding in Béal Átha'n Ghaorthaidh, however following recent developments which the submission notes suggests that National Flood Management (NFM) solutions could be used to mitigate flood risk and that this would have much less impact on the visual amenity in the village. The submission also notes that the Coiste have developed a proposal or an NFM pilot study under the European Innovation Partnerships (EIP) scheme which unfortunately failed in second stage funding. The submission requests that this project should be explored, and a new design sought, especially as at the time of the CFRAMs study, OPW was unaware of the proposed WWTP upgrade, the design of which it notes, requires further loss of river floodplain close to the village centre. The submission requests that until a solution is implemented, the OPW should commit (through Cork county council) to continue with periodic river clearance below the village of Ballingeary, which has been shown to reduce flood risk.</p> <p>The submission notes too, that the Coiste is in the late stages of a LEADER-funded feasibility study (through Údarás na Gaeltachta) to develop "An Súgán: Museum of the Irish Language &amp; Gaelic Revival". It is noted that</p>

	<p>this initiative will support the community, provide a multi-use venue for community and education use (future Coláiste na Mumhan students) and provide a cultural tourism attraction of national significance and the Coiste has also acquired a parcel of land just to the west of the village which is planned to become a boardwalk trail, Nature reserve and Blue way start off point.</p> <p>The submission also notes other structures of note in the village including the bridges at either end of the village, the stepping stones and the proposed museum building adjacent to the church.</p> <p>The submission notes the paragraph in the plan which outlines that the landscape setting of the village needs to be adequately protected (4.7.22) stating that it seems to prevent local families from being able to provide housing for their children, and meanwhile, wind farms are allowed to proliferate. The submission states that the community feel that 'enough is enough' and that the cumulative effect of more wind farm developments needs to be taken into consideration and that the community feels that it has received minimal community benefit from the Wind Farms that have been built to date.</p> <p>Finally, the submission comments on each objective as set out for Béal Atha 'n Ghaorthaidh in the draft plan, especially with reference to the main points in this submission, the projects proposed, those underway and where through the work of the Coiste the objectives of the plan could be realised given the required funding.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Coiste support the policies of the CDP.</li> <li>2. Can the CDP provide greater clarity regarding the provision of an adequate wastewater treatment plant?</li> <li>3. Can the CDP influence solutions to flooding? that until a solution is implemented, the OPW should commit (through Cork county council) to continue with periodic river clearance below the village of Ballingearry, which has been shown to reduce flood risk.</li> <li>4. The Coiste is in the late stages of a LEADER-funded feasibility study (through Údarás na Gaeltachta) to develop “An Súgán: Museum of the Irish Language &amp; Gaelic Revival”</li> <li>5. Are the structures of note (Bridges) included on the record of Protected Structures?</li> <li>6. Do the proposed wind energy policies in the CDP take the cumulative effect of more wind farm developments into consideration and allow for community gain?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted and welcomed.</li> <li>2. This County Development Plan has been prepared having regard to the most up to date Irish Water Investment Plan covering the period 2020-2024 (Revenue Control Period 3), which was amended and approved by the Commission of the Regulation of Utilities in the Summer of 2020. In addition, Irish Water have commenced the preparation of a National Water Resource Plan, a 25-year strategic plan that will outline how it is intended to move towards a sustainable, secure and reliable public drinking water supply and how Irish Water intends to maintain the balance between supply from water sources and demand for drinking water in the short, medium and long term whilst protecting the environment.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The Coastal and Flood Projects Department in Cork County Council works in partnership with the Office of Public Works (OPW) on the delivery of major flood relief schemes within the county. This section also coordinates the funding application process for smaller flood mitigation schemes under the OPW's Coastal &amp; Non-Coastal Minor Works Scheme and also procures the delivery of capital coastal infrastructure projects, with funding assistance from Government Departments, principally the Department of Agriculture, Food &amp; Marine. The detail of a design solution is outside of the scope of the development plan process.</li> <li>4. This is noted and supported.</li> <li>5. Yes, the Ballyvourney Bridge (RPS ID 366) is on the Record of Protected Structures.</li> <li>6. Yes, ET 13.7: Open to Consideration areas states that in planning such development, consideration should also be given to the cumulative impacts of such proposals. The plan also states that 'Large scale renewable energy projects should seek to provide for a community gain element to the establishment of such infrastructure in local areas as outlined in the Programme for Government.'</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required</li> <li>4. No Amendment Required</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required</li> <li>6. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Coiste Forbartha Réidh na nDoirí &amp; Mullach na Réidh Teo</b>
<b>DCDP345392798</b>	DCDP345392798
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the development boundary for Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) Gaeltacht village is included by name in the 2022-2088 Development plan.</p> <p>The submission sets out the wide ranging services available in the village, including the community centre, Ionad Áise, which provides a space for social activities, classes and remote working. The submission also notes that there are two vacant commercially zoned sites, with three phase power, and their own water and sewerage disposal units situated only four miles from the N22 road. The submission notes the public transport, education, religious, sporting, and local services, including post office, shop, mobile library availability in the village. The submission argues that in order to maintain these facilities within this 'transitional area' that the village is included in the development plan. The submission notes that there is potential to encourage high quality jobs through the commercial serviced sites mentioned above and also notes that the village needs more housing but that this would require a public freshwater storage and distribution system. The submission proposes that the housing policy for transitional rural areas should include an extra clause to allow housing development in this area for those working in local factories, shops, hotels, cafés so that</p>

	<p>employees would not have to commute outwards from larger towns and it is suggested that this measure would actually reduce a lot of the pressure to build in larger more distant towns which are already under pressure to provide services for their own people. The submission proposes that up to 10 houses be allowed to be built in the surrounding area. The submission favours the promotion of solar energy panels over wind arguing that it would be of huge economic benefit and save the landscape from further destruction.</p> <p>The submission requests that Cork County Council recognise the Gaeltacht status of the village and the cultural, historical and tourism opportunities in the area connecting all the local villages from Ballyvourney to Cúil Aodha, Réidh na nDoirí, Béal Atha an Ghaorthaidh &amp; Cill na Martra. In addition, the submission proposes better lighting in the village area, with picnic tables and a playground for the community centre, and the development of a historical cottage as a tourism and heritage attraction together with cycleways and walkways.</p> <p>Please also refer to Submission Reference Number DCDP344641404 from the same Interested Party</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) be included on the list of settlements for the CDP?</li> <li>2. Should the housing policy for transitional rural areas include an extra clause to allow housing development in this area for those working in local factories?</li> <li>3. Can the CDP favour solar energy panels over wind?</li> <li>4. Can the CDP request that the Council recognise the Gaeltacht status of the village?</li> <li>5. Can the CDP propose additional facilities, community facilities, tourism and heritage attractions etc in this Gaeltacht area?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.</li> <li>2. The rural housing policy of the Draft Plan is based on the Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities published in 2005 which remain in force. The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage have indicated that new guidelines are being prepared to address rural housing issues and to take account of the Flemish Decree, the National Planning Framework and broader settlement context. Amongst other things it is anticipated that these guidelines will provide essential guidance on issues such as equal access to rural housing having regard to the freedom of movement across the EU, defining</li> </ol>

	<p>demonstrable social and economic need, identifying areas under urban pressure, and assessing the viability of town and villages. In the absence of new guidelines it is not feasible to reconcile the approach of the NPF with the detailed approach set out in the current guidelines which advocate that people who are part of the rural community should be accommodated there. The Council is therefore deferring a review of the rural housing policy of the plan until such time as guidelines are available to inform the review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. No, it is not for the CDP to favour one particular type of renewable energy over another but rather to provide policy guidance on the most appropriate locations for such projects in accordance with National Policy and Guidance.</li> <li>4. Yes, it is considered that the Gaeltacht areas need further prominence in the plan and amendment Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.3.2 makes reference to Macroom’s role as a ‘Baile Serviseacha’ or Gaeltacht service town and other proposed amendments regarding our cultural heritage in Chapter 16 are also proposed.</li> <li>5. The CDP proposes a wide range of Tourism and cultural objectives for the county generally and section 10.6 ‘Protection of Tourist Assets’ mentions specifically ‘The Gaeltacht areas which are of significant cultural heritage value and frequently visited by tourists’.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>4. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.3.2 and other Proposed Amendments for Chapter 16, Built and Cultural Heritage.</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Comharchumann Forbartha Mhuscraí</b>
<b>DCDP346174604</b>	DCDP346174604
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission is from a number of groups and committees in Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, including Mullach an Réidh Teo Réidh na nDoirí and Coiste Forbartha Réidh na nDoirí (Réidh na nDoirí development committee) and Coiste Pleanáil Teanga Mhúscraí (Muscraí Language Planning Committee). The submissions collectively request that the Múscraí Gaeltacht Heritage Plan, 2019 commissioned and adopted by Cork County Council needs to become the basis of a Local Area Plan for Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, (as set out under s.19(1)(a) of the Local Planning and Development Act 2000), and implemented as part of a coordinated strategy by the Council, Údarás na Gaeltachta and the local community.</p> <p>The submission states that this plan would reflect the overall strategic needs of Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, including issues of community, housing, transport, roads, economic development including tourism, infrastructure, language, tradition, culture and built and natural heritage which it argues needs to be approached in a holistic way, as well as, the local planning needs of the five villages that constitute Gaeltacht Mhúscraí.</p> <p>The submission notes that this has become more urgent due to the major projects that are impacting on the local area, such as the N22 By-pass, the</p>

	<p>building of a large housing estate in the area (70 houses in one estate), and that fact that Gaeltacht Mhúscraí will, according to current proposals, have 9 windfarms impacting on this population of just less than 4,000 people within the next 2-4 years.</p> <p>The submission notes that at a national level, under the 20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language, there are clear objectives seeking to counter threats in relation to language decline and population changes . The submission states that there are also very positive steps already taking place in the local community in relation to developing the tourism potential of the area, exploiting the potential of Coláiste Íosagáin to become a significant economic, social and cultural driver in the area, and the Language Planning process which will run until 2026 as well the new Gaeltacht Service Town designation for Macroom and on-going initiatives in relation to building models of sustainable development in the area. Specifically, regarding the future development of Réidh na nDoirí, the submission requests that water and sewerage infrastructure is provided and also notes that the village has two fully serviced business sites which need to be developed to support the village. The submission notes that the Ionad Áise in Réidh na nDoirí is a great community facility that can also support economic development and could support jobs in the public sector. Finally, the submission states that the development of interconnected, safe cycle and walking routes throughout the Gaeltacht Mhúscraí should be promoted and developed.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the Múscraí Gaeltacht Heritage Plan, 2019 commissioned and adopted by Cork County Council become the basis of a Local Area Plan for Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, (as set out under s.19(1)(a) of the Local Planning and Development Act 2000), and implemented as part of a coordinated strategy by the Council, Údarás na Gaeltachta and the local community?</li> <li>2. Does the CDP make reference to the 20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language?</li> <li>3. Does the plan make reference to the potential of Coláiste Íosagáin to become a significant economic, social and cultural driver in the area?</li> <li>4. Does the plan make reference to the Language Planning process which will run until 2026 as well the new Gaeltacht Service Town designation for Macroom</li> <li>5. Can the plan include provision for the future development of Réidh na nDoirí?</li> <li>6. Can the CDP include an objective for the development of interconnected, safe cycle and walking routes throughout the Gaeltacht Mhúscraí?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, Chapter 16 of Volume One of the plan has been amended to refer to this plan. It is also proposed to update the references to the Múscraí Gaeltacht Conservation Management and Interpretation Plan 2016-2030 in Volume 4 of the plan.</li> <li>2. Yes Chapter 16, of Volume One of the plan includes reference to this Strategy in section 'The Gaeltacht and Linguistic Heritage'.</li> <li>3. Yes, it is proposed to amend the plan to refer to Coláiste Íosagáin.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Yes, Proposed Amendment No 4.4.3.2 refers to the inclusion of Macroom's role as a 'Baile Serviseacha' or Gaeltacht service town in the plan.</li> <li>5. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.</li> <li>6. The CDP proposes a wide range of Tourism and cultural objectives for the county generally and section 10.6 'Protection of Tourist Assets' mentions specifically 'The Gaeltacht areas which are of significant cultural heritage value and frequently visited by tourists'. The development of walking and cycling facilities within this area and also the provision of long-distance walks (TO 10-7)</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.2.2 and other Proposed Amendments for Chapter 16, Built and Cultural Heritage.</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.8.7</li> <li>4. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.3.2</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required</li> <li>6. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Comharchumann Forbartha Mhuscraí &amp; GTeic</b>
<b>DCDP345849999</b>	DCDP345849999
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission is from a number of groups and committees in Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, including Comharchumann Forbartha Mhuscraí (Múscraí Development Co-op), Coiste Forbartha, Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh (Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh Development Committee), Na Bailte Slachtmhara (Tidy Towns Baile Mhúirne), Comhaltas Cosanta, Cúil Aodha, and Ionad Cultúrtha, Baile Mhúirne. The submission collectively requests that the Múscraí Gaeltacht Heritage Plan, 2019 commissioned and adopted by Cork County Council needs to become the basis of a Local Area Plan for Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, (as set out under s.19(1)(a) of the Local Planning and Development Act 2000), and implemented as part of a coordinated strategy by the Council, Údarás na Gaeltachta and the local community. The submission states that this plan would reflect the overall strategic needs of Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, including issues of community, housing, transport, roads, economic development including tourism, infrastructure, language, tradition, culture and built and natural heritage which it argues needs to be approached in a holistic way, as well as, the local planning needs of the five villages that constitute Gaeltacht Mhúscraí.</p> <p>The submission notes that this has become more urgent due to the major projects that are impacting on the local area, such as the N22 By-pass, the</p>



	<p>building of a large housing estate in the area (70 houses in one estate), and that fact that Gaeltacht Mhúscraí will, according to current proposals, have 9 windfarms impacting on this population of just less than 4,000 people within the next 2-4 years.</p> <p>The submission notes that at a national level, under the 20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language, there are clear objectives seeking to counter threats in relation to language decline and population changes. The submission states that there are also very positive steps already taking place in the local community in relation to developing the tourism potential of the area, exploiting the potential of Coláiste Iosagain to become a significant economic, social and cultural driver in the area, and the Language Planning process which will run until 2026 as well the new Gaeltacht Service Town designation for Macroom and on-going initiatives in relation to building models of sustainable development in the area.</p> <p>The submission also sets out specific social and service requirements for Baile Mhúirine/Baile Mhic Ire, including a Health Centre facility appropriate to the Gaeltacht area and growing population into the future, including provision of services and respite provision, a drop-in centre/gym facilities which was included as part of the Language Plan to provide a drop-in centre for young people in the area and also the provision of creche facilities through Irish. In addition, the submission requests the provision of water services in Réidh na nDoirí together with the development of its serviced business sites and the development of local walking and cycling routes for the promotion of interconnected, safe, walking and cycling routes throughout Gaeltacht Mhúscraí.</p> <p>In relation to Cúil Aodha, the submission expresses disappointment that it is not referenced at all in the development plan despite having a vibrant community and a growing population, as evidenced by the increase in the number of pupils at Cúil Aodha Barr d'Ínse NS. The submission requests support for its local facilities, including the Áras Éamon Mac Suibhne, Ionad Óige Dónal Ó Liatháin, the Playing Field and, in particular, Cúil Aodha Swimming Pool with a request that the toilets are upgraded for disabled users. Finally, the submission also requests, that the Council support housing needs in the area and prioritise the Gaeltacht status of the community in the future approach to same. The submission requests a meeting with senior representatives from Cork County Council to discuss and agree future development needs and possibilities.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the Múscraí Gaeltacht Heritage Plan, 2019 commissioned and adopted by Cork County Council become the basis of a Local Area Plan for Gaeltacht Mhúscraí, (as set out under s.19(1)(a) of the Local Planning and Development Act 2000), and implemented as part of a coordinated strategy by the Council, Údarás na Gaeltachta and the local community?</li> <li>2. Does the CDP make reference to the 20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language?</li> <li>3. Does the plan make reference to the potential of Coláiste Iosagain to become a significant economic, social and cultural driver in the area?</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Does the plan make reference to the Language Planning process which will run until 2026 as well the new Gaeltacht Service Town designation for Macroom?</li> <li>5. Can the plan include provision for the future development of Cúil Aodha and Réidh na nDoirí?</li> <li>6. Can the plan include specific social and service requirements for Baile Mhúrine/Baile Mhic Ire, including a Health Centre facility appropriate to the Gaeltacht area including provision of services and respite provision, a drop-in centre/gym facilities which was included as part of the Language Plan to provide a drop-in centre for young people in the area and also the provision of creche facilities through Irish?</li> <li>7. Can the CDP include an objective for the development of interconnected, safe cycle and walking routes throughout the Gaeltacht Mhúscraí?</li> <li>8. Does the CDP include a policy regarding the Gaeltacht status of the community in future development?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, Section 2 of Volume 4, Chapter 4 will be amended as will Chapter 16 of Volume One of the plan to refer to this plan. It is also proposed to delete the references to the Múscraí Gaeltacht Conservation Management and Interpretation Plan 2016-2030 in Volume 4 of the plan.</li> <li>2. Yes Chapter 16, of Volume One of the plan includes reference to this Strategy in section 'The Gaeltacht and Linguistic Heritage'.</li> <li>3. Yes, it is proposed to amend the plan to refer to Coláiste Íosagain.</li> <li>4. Yes, Proposed Amendment No 4.4.3.2 refers to the inclusion of Macroom's role as a 'Baile Serviseacha' or Gaeltacht service town in the plan. See also amendment to policy 'HE 16-22: Gaeltacht Areas'.</li> <li>5. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.</li> <li>6. It is proposed to update the paragraph under 'Community Facilities' to mention these facilities.</li> <li>7. The CDP proposes a wide range of Tourism and cultural objectives for the county generally and section 10.6 'Protection of Tourist Assets' mentions specifically 'The Gaeltacht areas which are of significant cultural heritage value and frequently visited by tourists'. The development of walking and cycling facilities within this area and also the provision of long-distance walks (TO 10-7)</li> <li>8. Yes, these issues are addressed in amended policy HE 16-22: Gaeltacht Areas (Amendment No 1.16.30)</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.2.2</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.8.7</li> <li>4. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.3.2 and Refer to Amendment 1.16.30 (Regarding Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage)</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required</li> <li>6. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.8.6</li> <li>7. No Amendment Required</li> <li>8. Refer to Amendment 1.16.30 (Regarding Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage)</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Creedon Family</b>
<b>DCDP346183196</b>	DCDP346183196
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission concerns lands about c.6Ha in total at Kilnagurteen Lower to the north of Macroom and requests that consideration be given to a Special Policy Area type zoning, allowing Residential, Commercial or Office Development, but with the emphasis on the latter two options.</p> <p>The submission notes that in the current Macroom Town Plan, that 2 Ha of the overall holding is zoned as Medium Density Residential but that it is now proposed in the draft as Agricultural, with the remainder lands outside the development boundary. The submission argues that the lands the subject of the submission are located in a fully serviced area immediately adjacent to the existing built-up areas, and less than 700m, measured as the crow flies, and less than 1 km by road, from the Town Centre it further notes that while the lands are suitable for all proposed uses, that it is probably the only one suited to light industry anywhere near the town centre and that the absence of such an option would seriously limit the options for attracting industry to the town.</p> <p>The submission states that in the case of the stream running North&gt;South in the centre of the map, the flooding position is entirely misrepresented, due to the fall and minor obstructions that the possibility of the waters overflowing to any significant extent into the field is effectively non-existent, no matter how extreme the flood event might be. The submission includes a detailed level survey for the lands in order to fully show the significant slope on the lands. The submission also notes that the plan shows the area South of the Creedon lands to be also potentially subject to flooding, but that was not seen as a reason not to zone those lands for Business (MM-B-01) and requests that the same criteria be used in considering the lands the subject of this submission. In addition, the submission queries the basis for the Green Infrastructure designation in the plan and confirms that while there is no objection or difficulty with the concept of a 'Green Corridor' along the stream at the eastern boundary, it is submitted that it should be confined to a much narrower width noting that it is about 20m wide in the current Plan.</p> <p>The submission argues that the lands are fully serviced with water &amp; mains sewerage connections available, surface water disposal to the stream on site with attenuation and that the road fronting the site is a full 2 lane road.</p> <p>The submission also notes recent planning history on the site where the</p>

	Council defended the current medium density zoning and queries why this zoning is now abandoned.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission is considered to meet the criteria in relation to its sequential location and will help to consolidate development in this area. <i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.16
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Croí na Laoi Rural Development Co-Op Society and Tidy Towns</b>
<b>DCDP346188018</b>	DCDP346188018
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission concerning the village of Inchigeelagh welcomes the emphasis placed on tourism in the draft plan as well as the overall proposal for 20 homes which it notes is in keeping with the existing beauty and landscaping of the area. The submission states that the Croí na Laoi Rural Development Co-Op Society and Tidy Towns, look forward to working together on these plans.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Support for the CDP and in particular the emphasis placed on tourism.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. This is noted and welcomed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dan Creedon &amp; Family</b>
<b>DCDP346185413</b>	DCDP346185413
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission concerns lands about c.1.4 Ha in total at Kilnagurteen Lower to the north of Macroom. The submission is requesting that the low density residential zoning currently zoned in the Macroom Town Plan for 'Low Density Residential' be maintained or it is also suggested that medium density residential development would also be appropriate. The submission states that there is a heavy reliance in the draft plan on the provision of residential units within the town and that while this may be in line with the National Planning Guidelines, that they are just that guidelines. In further arguing this point, and proposing the further need to zone greenfield lands over and above those identified in the draft plan, the submission states that there is an over estimation of the 'living over the

	<p>shop' and the identification of spaces which would require agreement of multiple landowners with some sites no nearer development now that when they were first suggested 50 years ago. The submission also argues that some areas (on the Millstreet and Killarney/Codrum road) which are almost 3/4 mile further out from the Town Centre or are at a similar height relative to other developments in the town and are zoned or developed and states that there is an inexplicable, inconsistency, even unfairness with the current approach.</p> <p>The submission states that the lands are serviced, have a connection agreement with the developers of the 'Lawn' development, with surface water proposals and public water adjacent and have good access to the town centre via the main Masseytown Road. The submission also suggests appropriate landscaping for the site and notes that the 'Physical Constraints Map' in the current Plan has a significant inaccuracy in relation to these lands - as two Areas of "Bog and Wetlands" are shown in the field just above the lands – with the submission stating that neither exist, and remarking that it is difficult to see how or why they were so identified.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</li> <li>2. Why was MM-R-04 Zoned given its distance from the town centre or core of the settlement?</li> <li>3. Can the flood mapping on the draft plans be updated? Are their inaccuracies in the current mapping?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission while not forming part of the land supply in this plan is considered to be suitable for development and although designated Agricultural in this plan it will be considered in the next CDP Review. <i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i></li> <li>2. The reason that MM-R-04 was included in the draft plan maps, was to reflect the fact that 50 units had been granted on the site in 2020.</li> <li>3. The SFRA prepared for this plan uses the most up to date data and modelling and an amendment to show the extent of the Flood Zones will also be prepared by amendment to this plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.7</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Dan Lane</b>
<b>DCDP346285371</b>	DCDP346285371

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests to have the Rylane village boundary extended to the east of the village. It also states that this land forms part of a field to the immediate west which is already included within the settlement boundary. It is noted that Rylane is a central location with potential for growth, but that there are not enough lands within the proposed development boundary to cater for the suggested 21 new dwellings in the draft County Development Plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the village boundary be extended to accommodate a site part of which is located within the village development boundary?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that this can be accommodated as it is small in scale and will regularise and reflect the land / field pattern on the ground.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.22.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Danielle Lynch</b>
<b>DCDP346228154</b>	<b>DCDP346228154</b>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submitter requests that the Metropolitan Green Belt Zone is moved 100 metres. The submitter notes that their primary residence is within the Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence zone and that this request would allow them to apply for permission to live on their family land.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the Rural Housing Policies be amended?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The rural housing policy of the Draft Plan is based on the Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities published in 2005 which remain in force. The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage have indicated that new guidelines are being prepared to address rural housing issues and to take account of the Flemish Decree, the National Planning Framework and broader settlement context. Amongst other things it is anticipated that these guidelines will provide essential guidance on issues such as equal access to rural housing having regard to the freedom of movement across the EU, defining demonstrable social and economic need, identifying areas under urban pressure, and assessing the viability of town and villages. In the absence of new guidelines it is not feasible to reconcile the approach of the NPF with the detailed approach set out in the current guidelines which advocate that people who are part of the rural community should be accommodated there. The Council is therefore deferring a review of the rural housing policy of the plan until such time as guidelines are available to inform the review.  See also Volume 1, of this report for further discussion on this issue
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Deirdre O'Donovan</b>
<b>DCDP346254620</b>	<b>DCDP346254620</b>

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>This submission requests a number of amendments to the Draft County Development plan regarding both existing business use and proposed new business uses. The submission firstly gives a background to O'Donovan Engineering which it states currently employs 55 people noting that the location of the current site has developed organically over the years. The submission states that the company are costing and considering options for extending the current site in order to provide additional space to facilitate growth and machinery investment and intend on applying for permission in the near future. The submission notes that as the current location is not zoned, the first request is to rezone the current site as "Existing Business use" as the submission states that without this zoning it could affect future planning submissions and they point to difficulties in getting services provided to the site, fibre broadband and roadworks on the R618 are provided as examples of this. The submission further requests that there is an amendment proposed to section 4.9.18 under employment and local activity to give recognition to O'Donovan Engineering as a key employer in the local community.</p> <p>In addition, the submission states that the current site may not have the scope to facilitate the total development required without significant site levelling and the submission notes that the current site is operating on 6 different levels for storage and manufacturing and that this is not efficient. In this regard, the submission also requests the rezoning of a new site for "Business use". The submission states that this site to the south of the R618 is suitable due to its proximity to the existing facility and development boundary allows for future expansion and the site levels are better.</p> <p>The submission notes that the B-01 within the village of Coachford is currently not being offered for development. The submission notes that the preferred option is to stay within Coachford and continue with the commitment to support job creation within the local community and to support eco friendly design, but it also states that if they cannot get the support required to facilitate development and continue to grow the business in the local community, that they will have to consider the option of moving part, or all of the operations to a new site.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can this site located outside of the development boundary of Coachford be zoned as "Existing Business use"?</li> <li>2. Can section 4.9.18 under employment and local activity be amended to give recognition to O'Donovan Engineering as a key employer in the local community?</li> <li>3. Can an additional site be zoned for Business uses as the site within the current development boundary is not available?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generally sites for established business uses outside of development boundaries are not zoned as such but it is the intention of the CDP and Amendment Policies such as EC 8-12 – Business Development in Rural Areas to strengthen and support rural business.</li> <li>2. Yes it is proposed to acknowledge O'Donovan Engineering as key local employers in the Coachford area.</li> <li>3. It is proposed to review all employment lands within the draft 2 years post adoption of the CDP and this will include B-01 in</li> </ol>



	Coachford. This will enable a more evidence-based analysis of the employment and business lands required and if further lands are required they can be addressed at that stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required but refer to Proposed Amendments 1.8.17 and 1.8.18</li> <li>2. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.9.2</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>DCDP346228154 Interested Party</b>	<b>Donal Casey</b>
<b>DCDP342630019</b>	DCDP342630019
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that Objective DB-01 the potential development of the zoned area in Upper Dripsey be reverted to 25 houses as per the current LAP. In noting that the draft plan has suggested 5 additional units for the area during the new plan period the submission argues that this should be increased due to (1) the growing population in the area, (2) Upper Dripsey's proximity to amenities in Coachford, Macroom and Ballincollig and (3) the current demand for housing and sites in the area, that by allowing for a more appropriate number of dwellings to be built, which are sympathetic to the surrounding environs, that it would have a positive impact on the area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the proposed potential unit development for Upper Dripsey be increased to 25?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The level of 5 units for Upper Dripsey is primarily because of the lack of capacity of the waste water infrastructure and it is intended that the maximum of 5 units can allow for individual waste water systems to allow some development take place over the lifetime of the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donall McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP346269923</b>	DCDP346269923
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the development boundary of Ballynora Village is extended to incorporate an area of land to accommodate 8 proposed houses which would progress immediately if zoned. The submission states that other sites within the village have not been developed for the last 13 years and that the lands on the opposite side of the village were refused permission. The submission states that the dwelling houses will be serviced by a treatment unit and polishing filter and that that all testing has been completed. The submissions have also confirmed feasibility of the assessment submitted to Irish Water and a full flood report is attached to the submission confirming feasibility for the proposed development without flood zone effect. The submission states that the subject lands provide good permeability to the village through the GAA grounds and are close to amenities and community facilities. It is also proposed in the submission that a site would be provided by the applicant in the heart of the village for a playground. The submission further states

	that there is huge demand for this type of development in the area and that the greenbelt is under enormous pressure from housing and that this proposal would provide a natural consolidation of the development boundary.
Principal Issues Raised	1. Can the development boundary of Ballynora be extended?
Chief Executive's Response	1. It is considered that given the scale of development (8 units) over the lifetime of the plan that no further lands can be included for development.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	1. No Amendment required.
Interested Party	<b>Donncha Murphy</b>
DCDP344117271	DCDP344117271
Submission Summary	This submission proposes an extension of the development boundary in Coachford village (to the east at Clontead More townland). The submission argues that the inclusion of these lands within the settlement boundary will assist in meeting identified housing targets, provide for a consolidation of the village given that they are located approximately 150 m from the centre, that development here would be in keeping with the existing settlement pattern, and given the location abutting the R619 there would be access to existing water and wastewater services. <b>NOTE: This submission supersedes DCDP330692580</b>
Principal Issues Raised	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Coachford?
Chief Executive's Response	1. The amendments to this plan make provision for up to 95 units within the development boundary of Coachford over the life of the plan. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
Chief Executive's Recommendation	1. No Amendment Required.
Interested Party	<b>Donncha Murphy</b>
DCDP330692580	DCDP330692580
Submission Summary	Submission requests to have lands in the townland of Clontead More (Coachford) included in the County Development Plan 2021. Submission argues that there is a need for land for housing in the village of Coachford and includes an aerial photo of the said lands. <b>This submission was superseded by DCDP344117271.</b>
Principal Issues Raised	1. Please refer to Submission DCDP344117271.
Chief Executive's Response	1. Please refer to Submission DCDP344117271.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Please refer to Submission DCDP344117271.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Duggan Steel Limited – Macroom MD</b>
<b>DCDP346045818</b>	<b>DCDP346045818</b>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks policy support for the use of lands approximately 4km outside Millstreet at Annagloor for the provision of a storage yard for articulated trailers to support the existing operations of Duggan Steel Ltd. The submission argues that due to the continued expansion of Duggan Steel's manufacturing operations, that they require storage space for up to 60 no. articulated trailers at any given time, which represents a considerable land space requirement. The submission provides a detailed planning history noting that the proposed storage use on these lands while granted by Cork County Council was subsequently refused by An Bord Pleanála (ABP). The submission argues that this refusal by ABP was primarily because the concentration of economic and employment development should be within the existing pattern of settlements and located on zoned lands and it is also argued that this decision was influenced by Duggan Steel's proposals for a fabrication facility on adjacent lands at the time which lead to a perception that an intensification of industrial activity would occur in this rural area.</p> <p>It is noted that both the existing and Draft County Plans include policy support for particular types of industrial use that are better suited to un zoned rural lands outside of main settlements. It is also noted that while the subject lands are adjacent to an SAC they are not subject to any environmental, landscape, visual or other protections and could effectively accommodate the proposed use subject to normal planning and development considerations. The characteristics of the proposed use are that there would be no built structures, no significant emissions onsite, it would not require the installation of services as there would be no permanent staffing presence, and that traffic to and from the site would be limited to the intermittent movement of heavy goods to and from the area and that these movements would occur during normal working hours.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the plan provide policy support for a storage yard for articulated trailers to support the existing operations of Duggan Steel Ltd?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Yes, it is the intention of the CDP and Amendment Policies such as EC 8-12 – Business Development in Rural Areas to strengthen and support rural business. In addition, it is proposed to review all employment lands within the 2 years post adoption of the CDP and this will include the existing land supply in Millstreet. This will enable a more evidence-based analysis of the employment and business lands required and if further lands are required they can be addressed at that stage
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment Nos. 1.8.17 and 1.8.18
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Healy Family Gurteenroe</b>
<b>DCDP345724436</b>	<b>DCDP345724436</b>

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>This submission requests that the current development boundary at Gurteenroe &amp; Kilnagurteen be reinstated with the lands to the north of the proposed relief road to be zoned for medium density residential development. The submission refers to an overall holding of about 17 Ha, which it is stated is less than 1 km as the crow flies from the town centre (to the west). The submission in arguing that the current plan has a more sensible boundary and argues that the proposed development boundary for Macroom excludes suitable &amp; serviced lands which is states were 'cut out' of the fully serviced land supply for the town which are nearer town centre than any other similarly excluded/ unzoned lands.</p> <p>The submission states that the draft plan proposes a relief road the greater part of which will run through the middle, more or less, of the overall land holding cutting off c. 4 Ha including their farmhouse &amp; yard from the remainder of the family lands which the draft plan proposes as agricultural. In questioning the merit and rationale for the proposed relief road the submission states that it would significantly devalue the lands, and the suggestion that a small farm would be so bisected by a new road, without the normal compensatory “opening up” benefits is entirely unacceptable and, in the absence of any alteration in the zonings that the landowners object in the most strenuous manner to the road proposal.</p> <p>The submission also states that there is no indication that the lands zoned for an extension to the hospital site will be required for this purpose and if so that it would not require access from the proposed relief road.</p> <p>While the submission notes that parts of these lands are high, with other parts noticeably contoured, that given the residential developments that have taken place already to the east and west of the site that neither is a reason for exclusion from the development area.</p> <p>The submission points out that the guidance in the National Planning Framework requirement regarding 30% of the new units are to be provided from the existing built footprint, is referred to as a requirement in the Draft Plan and that this is a “one-size fits all” guidance for the country as a whole and is not achievable in Macroom, primarily due to a lack of suitable vacant buildings or infill sites.</p> <p>The submission notes that the lands are fully serviced, already served by mains water, and the main foul sewer is available at the southern extremity of the lands, and that the proposed relief road would give excellent access to the lands, but in the absence of same, that there is adequate scope for a connection to either the Masseytown roads or the existing N22 using only existing roads and the applicants own lands.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</li> <li>2. Is there a requirement for the relief road MM-U-02?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are mandatory requirements for the plan to provide opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth as set out in the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional</li> </ol>

	<p>Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission is considered to be proximate to the town centre and has been amended in this regard.</p> <p>2. It is important that when development is being planned in future plans that the relief road is identified as it has been in previous plans.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.18</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Humphrey Lynch</b>
<b>DCDP346258542</b>	DCDP346258542
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission covers a number of issues for the future development of Macroom town. Firstly, it states that parking should be maintained in market square in order for businesses to thrive, noting that in other European cities when parking was removed the towns became vacant and shops found it difficult to generate business.</p> <p>The submission suggests that pay parking should be reviewed so that it's fair for all.</p> <p>Regarding the castle demesne directly in front of the old castle tower the submission suggests that this should be acquired and developed into a public viewing area where tourists could visit and take photos which it notes could be developed in conjunction with the development of a tourist facility, in the location of the present fire station.</p> <p>The submission requests that the waste water sewerage system needs to be examined as due to the increase of houses in the Macroom area the existing facility is incapable of handling the increase, and adds that the sewerage vent in the square is an example of how the system is well outdated. It is also noted that the health of the river is essential to fishing and the possible development of water activity programs which it notes has vast potential if managed properly.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1. Does the CDP support the future development of Macroom Town?</p> <p>2. Does the CDP have a role regarding Pay Parking in the town to ensure that it is equitable?</p> <p>3. Can the CDP promote the use of the castle demesne as a tourist facility particularly where the current fire station is located?</p> <p>4. Is the Wastewater system capable of accommodating the future population of the town?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. It is considered that the CDP is very supportive of the future development of Macroom Town the proposed Movement and Urban Renewal Framework (MM-GO-06) will examine the best longer-term approach to car parking in the town.</p> <p>2. The issue of Pay Parking is outside of the scope of the Development Plan.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is intended that the opportunities for tourist related uses would be proposed on this site as outlined in the draft plan.</p> <p>4. Currently the Wastewater system is at capacity, however, options for improving capacity are currently being reviewed and prioritised</p>

	through the full options assessment (FOA) stage process as part of Irish Water's National Water Resources Plan. It is envisaged that the outcome of a preferred option will be available in Q3 2021 (Refer to Amendment 4.4.1.8)
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required</li> <li>4. Refer to Amendment 4.4.2.18</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Hunol Developments Limited – Macroom MD</b>
<b>DCDP346115240</b>	<b>DCDP346115240</b>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that objective for Dripsey Model Village DB-01 be amended so that the upper limit of 30 units be omitted and replaced with a new target of 70 units. The submission sets out the National, Regional and Local Planning Policy issues relevant as regards the future development of the settlement, and notes that a greater residential growth allocation for Dripsey in the forthcoming CDP is consistent with the objectives of the NPF, the RSES and the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines.</p> <p>The submission notes that the village has experienced elements of decline in recent years, including the loss of two local shops and that it has also lost out on the delivery of two playing pitches proposed under 07/13020. It is proposed that resolving the long-standing wastewater capacity issues provides an opportunity to reassess the villages role within the MD and help to 'reverse rural decline'.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is significant demand for one off housing in areas around Dripsey and Coachford and that the provision of additional high quality family dwellings in Dripsey Model Village will provide locals with an alternative to unsustainable single dwelling units and also provide them with an opportunity to live locally within a serviced settlement.</p> <p>In addition, the submission notes that Macroom MD spans a large geographical area and that it is predominantly a rural region where only 5 settlements out of 22 have adequate drinking water and wastewater infrastructure to accommodate the envisaged growth of development. The submission also proposes that in order to comply with regional policy and justify the capital investment made by Irish Water in upgrading the new Dripsey WWTP that it is necessary to recalibrate existing growth projections across the settlements and concentrate increased population growth allocation within settlements with appropriate infrastructure capacity such as Dripsey.</p> <p>The submission also appends a formal request for pre planning consultation on the subject site for a total of 63 no. units and includes a proposed layout of the site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the proposed potential unit development for Dripsey be increased to 70 units?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed 30 units development for Dripsey will allow for a phased development at a scale and density suitable for a village of this size. Given the proposed infrastructure improvements in the village particularly with regard to waste water services, consideration will be given to monitoring the development of</li> </ol>

	these proposed units over the lifetime of the plan and provision has been made for the transfer of units between villages within an MD subject to the policy guidance in Proposed Amendment. 4.4.10.1
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Vaughan</b>
<b>DCDP346099465</b>	DCDP346099465
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks to secure a Business and General Employment objective for all or part of 36.42ha (c. 90 acres) lands in total to facilitate small to medium sized light industry, distribution and warehouses uses, as well as an offline service station at Gurteenroe on the Millstreet Road (R582). The site is located to the north of the N22 Macroom Bypass to the north-west of the town currently under construction. The submission notes the planning policy objectives as contained in the National Planning Framework (NPF), 2018; the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) for the Southern Region, 2020, and the provisions of the current and draft Cork County Development Plan, as well as the existing LAP and Town Plan and in particular, the detailed guidance set out in the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (2012) and TII's Policy Statement on the Service Areas.</p> <p>The submission makes the case for the zoning of these lands based on the employment uplift envisaged in national, regional and local planning policy, and argues that the pattern of urban growth will be population and employment led, and will be sustainable, and that the average resident worker to job ratio in Macroom and the relatively low level of zoned employment land as set out in the draft Cork County Development Plan 2022. It is further argued in the submission that the lands are available for development, in single ownership, are constraint free in terms of built and natural heritage and can be serviced via upgrades to existing Irish Water assets. It is also argued that the development of these lands will contribute to the achievement of the NPO Objectives (specifically 1a, 1c,11 and 21) of the NPF and more suitable relative to the town centre than the proposed Business Zonings. Furthermore, it is also stated that there are only two service stations serving the town at present, therefore, the inclusion of a service station at this location will not result in a proliferation of such uses and it argues that it will not impact on the town centre.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there scope for additional Business lands and Employment lands in Macroom?</li> <li>2. Should the CDP identify a suitable location for a service station in the plan?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that this proposal would not be acceptable for an employment centre given its location outside the town development boundary close to a junction on the upgraded N22.</li> <li>2. Any proposal for an offline service station etc could be considered on its merits subject to the policies and objectives set out in Chapter 12 transport and Mobility, paragraph 12.16.5.</li> </ol>



<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jerry Lucey</b>
<b>DCDP346231236</b>	DCDP346231236
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests the extension of the existing development boundary at Sleaveen West, Macroom, to accommodate serviced sites. The submission notes that the sewer connection is adjacent to the lands, and there are 2 road frontages allowing for easy and safe access. The submission argues that the new by-pass is making Macroom a very attractive location and that there are no lands available in Macroom for serviced sites and that these lands are on the outskirts of the town but in good proximity to the GAA, playground, golf course and town centre is easily accessible.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission is considered to be very remote from the town centre and would not facilitate the orderly development of Macroom town.</li> </ol> <p><i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i></p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Proposed.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Jimmy Lynch</b>
<b>DCDP345232750</b>	DCDP345232750
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission concerns the future development of Macroom Town and notes the importance of parking for many of the small businesses within the town centre. Regarding MM REGEN 05, the submission states that reference is made to both sites, when there is only one site shown on the map which it notes is outdated as many of the gardens have been built on and the vacant properties are currently being refurbished. It also notes that there is mention of a multi-story car park without identifying a suitable site, which it notes might be used by those working but not shopping in the town.</p> <p>The submission also notes that the profile of customers in the town centre (older people and impulse buyers) require on street parking. It is noted that there are plans to remove parking from the Briery Gap which the submission notes should not be done, and while public realm and pedestrianisation are welcome they should not be at the expense of</p>

	parking spaces. It is also argued that the recent outdoor dining uses which have taken car parking spaces from the town have been bad for business and what is required now is plentiful, time limited, free well-regulated on-street parking.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the CDP support the future development of Macroom Town?</li> <li>2. Does the CDP have a role regarding provision of Pay Parking in the town? Is there a requirement for a multi storey car park?</li> <li>3. Does the proposed MM REGEN 05 refer to both sites?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that the CDP is very supportive of the future development of Macroom Town the proposed Movement and Urban Renewal Framework (MM-GO-06) will examine the best longer-term approach to car parking in the town.</li> <li>2. The issue of Pay Parking itself is outside of the scope of the Development Plan. However, as noted in Issue 1 above, the proposed Movement and Urban Renewal Framework Plan to be completed under MM-GO-06 is intended to investigate this and the requirement for a multi storey car park in the town; 'The long and short stay parking needs of the town including an assessment of the requirement for a multi storey car park.'</li> <li>3. Yes, this will be amended, as it was intended to refer to MM REGEN 04, North of Market Square and MM REGEN 05 South of Market Square.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.11</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joan O' Leary</b>
<b>DCDP345222173</b>	DCDP345222173
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission is a request to extend the development boundary of Macroom town to the south at Sleeveen East and to zone the subject lands comprising approximately 1.25 Ha for medium density residential development. The subject lands are bounded by the Macroom development boundary to the North and a number of detached residential dwellings to the west and south.</p> <p>The submission outlines the NPF and Draft CDP planning policy background and argues that there is insufficient zoned land available to deliver the 399 units identified for Macroom town over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The submission argues that the subject lands are suitable for medium density residential development, outside of the flood zone A and B and, if developed, are likely to relieve the pressure for less-appropriate one-off dwellings in the surrounding rural area.</p> <p>In addition, the submission notes that the landowner has received expressions of interest from commercial operators to develop the lands and if re-zoned, will be in a position to apply for planning permission for a residential housing development in a timely fashion.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission, although contiguous to the development boundary and small in nature is located in an area of very low density housing and is considered to be more remote from the town centre and therefore not facilitate or contribute to the orderly development of Macroom town.</p> <p><i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i></p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joanne Goold</b>
<b>DCDP344302199</b>	DCDP344302199
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks to have the requirement for office uses removed from the 'Special Policy Area' MM-X-01 Macroom. The submission notes that the MM-X-01 is within walking distance of the town centre, schools and recreational sites and that residential development is more in keeping with the development of such an area. The submission also makes reference to the impact of the Covid pandemic and the realised option of being able to work remotely from home, that the requirement for office development, if needed, would be better located where the majority of offices are currently located in the town centre or in the newer retail area to the east of the town.</p> <p>The submission suggests that off road pedestrian and cycleways to the south could link the area, via the recently constructed pedestrian bridge to the town centre, playground and sports facilities and that this would help to achieve the Government's 'Healthy Ireland' policy and keep children off main roads.</p> <p>Finally, the submission states that the inclusion for a requirement of office space in the Special Policy Area may also deter much needed interest in residential development, noting that 30% of which, is to be within the existing footprint of the settlement as stated in section 4.3.9 of the plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the requirement for office uses be removed from the 'Special Policy Area MM-X-01?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that this site, given its large size (12 Ha) and its strategic location close to the town centre and in the centre of well established existing residential and amenity space that it would be better suited to a mix of uses including office based development. It was considered that either one use or the other would be too overwhelming in this strategic site but that the mix of uses affords a better opportunity to allow for people to live near

	to their place of work thereby implementing the core aims and principles of this CDP and National Planning Policy and Guidance.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joe McCarthy</b>
<b>DCDP345959849</b>	DCDP345959849
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission makes an argument for the inclusion of two sites in Killumney-Ovens. The first, Parcel A, c.0.25 hectares in area, is located in the townland of Grange, abutting the Killumney development boundary and it is requested that this should be included within the development boundary as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' as it is noted that this site although falling within the N22 Exclusion Corridor would be more accurately portrayed as such.</p> <p>The submission states that the 300m N22 route protection buffer has severed the Key Village and impacted on its ability to consolidate into a compact settlement since 2005. The delineation of the 300m route buffer is indicative and includes protected structures, national monuments and existing housing, with additional new housing having been granted within the buffer in the intervening years. The submission notes that MHL Consulting Engineers have reviewed the buffer and consider that it can realistically be reduced to a 100m reserve, taking into consideration these impediments through the standard route selection procedure would unlock significant lands in the centre of the settlement to enhance the coherence of the settlement's form.</p> <p>The second Parcel Parcel B, c. 3.8 hectares in area, is located to the south of the N22 Macroom Road, and is proposed for 'mixed / general business / industrial uses' beside Athnowen Graveyard and abuts the Ovens development boundary, it can be accessed via an existing local road (L-6399). The submission provides a detailed policy context to support this proposal including the NPF, Future Jobs Ireland, RSES, Cork MASP, CDP 2015, Blarney Macroom MD LAP 2017 and finally it is noted that the Draft CDP recognises the significant contribution that the settlement makes to the 'South Cork and Lower Harbour Growth Triangle' Economic Sub Cluster, of which Killumney Ovens is identified as a principal location. It is further considered that having regard to the site's locational advantages, adjacent to EMC Ireland, located within the Metropolitan Cork Area and benefitting from access to excellent public transport and the existing and proposed N22 national road, that the exclusion of these lands from the development boundary and the absence of any targeted land use zoning objectives to be a missed opportunity. Finally, the submission notes that although that part of the site is located within the Flood Zone A, the proposed logistics uses are considered to be a less vulnerable development type and that a Justification Test would be required as part of any planning application.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can Parcel A be included within the development boundary as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses'?</li> <li>2. Can Parcel B be included within the development boundary and zoned for mixed / general business / industrial uses?</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. Notwithstanding the point raised in the submission regarding the proposed N22 Corridor, TII in their submission have raised this issue stating that development strategic or rezoning proposals should not have the effect of altering the function of these routes / improvements schemes or importantly, increase the cost of land to be acquired or under active consideration as a route option of a national road scheme. Such proposals while potentially bringing major financial gains to the property owners involved, would be at variance with the broader public interest and would, by significantly increasing the cost of the land to be acquired for road scheme, reduce the funding available to the Authority for road construction and improvement work generally. In addition, Section 2.9 of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines also advise that development of local area plan should identify land required for future national road projects including objectives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain required lands free from development and</li> <li>• Ensure that measures are put in place so that any adjacent development of sensitive uses, such as housing, schools and nursing homes are compatible with the construction and long term operation of the road.</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore considered in appropriate and contrary to National Policy to include these lands within the development boundary.</p> <p>2. It is considered that this site would not pass the justification test, as there are other sites within the development boundary that could cater for this use and are not within a flood risk area.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Farrell</b>
<b>DCDP346239644</b>	DCDP346239644
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the lands zoned as MM-AG-04 be rezoned as Medium density residential development. The submission argues that this site is immediately adjacent to the existing zoned residential lands and has all the necessary water services, access, with a topography which makes it easily developable. The submission also notes that the lands are on the outskirts of the town and are easily accessible with road frontage, and are close to the School, Church, GAA pitch, playground and shops.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>2. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first</p>

	<p>instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission while not forming part of the land supply in this plan is considered to be suitable for development and although designated Agricultural in this plan it will be considered in the next CDP Review.</p> <p><i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i></p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Lucey</b>
<b>DCDP346234865</b>	DCDP346234865
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that an extension of the proposed development boundary at Millstreet Road, Gurteenroe, Macroom and to rezone the land from passive open space to medium density housing. The submission states that this will extend the existing streetscape and give a uniform look to the estate as the site is immediately adjacent to both the Lios na Fea housing development and the proposed development which is about to start construction. The submission states that this proposal would not have any effect on the passive open space or interfere with the Codrum Woods and that services are located immediately outside the site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the CDP change the layout of an existing planning permission?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. No, it is not possible to change the permitted layout of an existing planning permission through the development plan process. The site in question is included within MM-R-04 and is zoned for residential development.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Lyons</b>
<b>DCDP339757226</b>	DCDP339757226
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission states that the plan is very informative and agrees with the general approach and recommendations, particularly the compact growth model. The submission also makes a number of suggestions regarding specific wordings used in the draft for example the submitter disagrees that the River 'occasionally' bursts its banks and suggests that the reference to canoe / dinghy and sailing is a bit aspirational for the town. The submission makes reference to Macroom's role as a 'Baile Serviseacha' as a service town for the Gaeltacht and also notes Macroom's untapped potential as a centre for walking cycling and hiking noting its unique position close to a range of natural amenities, the Wild Atlantic Way, the McGillyCuddy Reeks, the Boggeraghs, the Shekys, and Farran Wood etc.</p> <p>The submission notes that regeneration site MM REGEN 06 could possibly be developed as a youth centre or youth café given its location and history and is unclear as to what the River Quarter Special Policy Area means. The submission suggests that the Macroom Walking Guide should be updated and that the Coolehane Road should not be on any walking guide as it is too dangerous.</p> <p>The submission would like to see more specifics regarding the Co-working</p>

	<p>hubs and queries the number of references to Mount Massey in the plan. The submission agrees that the range of tourist accommodation in the town is badly lacking and suggests that that premises like the former Victoria Hotel in the North Square would be ideal for some hostel type accommodation instead of lying idle.</p> <p>The submitter notes that he has had difficulty accessing details of the 53 buildings or sites listed for protection in the 2009 plan and also refers to the lack of knowledge surrounding the Architectural Conservation Areas in the town. The submission also notes that more information should be made available regarding Biodiversity and its role in the future of the town including reference to Macroom's Pollinator Plan which could, along with the various associated activities, be set out in the plan.</p> <p>Finally, the submission suggests that the town is too small to accommodate proposals for a tourist office and interpretative centre at the old Church of Ireland and suggests that a number of ventures might be better coming together particularly civic and information services including a citizens information bureau, providing a one stop shop in a venue like the redeveloped Briery Gap which might be more suitable given its base as a community services / library role.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the CDP adequately address flooding issues in Macroom? Should additional text be included to make reference to Macroom's role as a service town for the Gaeltacht, and also its Pollinator Plan?</li> <li>2. Should the plan Include reference to youth centre or youth café in MM REGEN 06?</li> <li>3. Can the plan seek to update the Macroom Walking Guide?</li> <li>4. Does the plan support the development of further business hubs in Macroom?</li> <li>5. Where are the Record of Protected Structure available to view?</li> <li>6. Is the wording re the MM REGEN 04 appropriate for the site (Church of Ireland Church)?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance and all the relevant mapping and policy amendments have been incorporated into this document.</li> <li>2. This submission makes a number of valid suggestions regarding Macroom's role as a service town for the Gaeltacht, the Pollinator Plan for the town and the potential the town has in further developing its role as a centre for walking cycling and hiking.</li> <li>3. It is proposed that the development description for MM REGEN 06 should be broadened to include a youth cafe / youth centre. The proposals for the River Quarter Special Policy Area originated in the Town Development Plan (2009) and the proposed policy is outlined in objective reference MM-X-01. Regarding the Macroom Walking Guide this initiative is outside of the scope of the CDP Review but will be shared with the MD Office in Macroom.</li> <li>4. Similarly, the Co-working hubs policy is set out in Volume One of the Plan and will be further implemented by the Business Growth</li> </ol>



	<p>Hub of the Council in conjunction with the MD Office and the LEOs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The 53 buildings which are now on the County Council's Record of Protected Structures are listed in Volume Two of the Plan and also available to view on the Map Brower for the plan (Volume 7)</li> <li>6. Regarding the proposals for the Church of Ireland Church this wording will be revised to include reference to other uses and not limit its redevelopment to tourism / cultural uses as suggested. The proposals for the redevelopment of the Briery Gap will be implemented by the Macroom MD Office and other community and complementary uses will be considered on their merits.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.2 and 4.4.3.12</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.11</li> <li>4. No Amendment Required</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required</li> <li>6. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.11</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Joseph Lawler</b>
<b>DCDP345074418</b>	DCDP345074418
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the Council would look at the biodiversity value of the wood in Lackabawn Millstreet, that is included in the area MS GB 2. The submission notes that this wood is home to a wide variety of animals and birds and that it is also very good for the environment with all the tree's thus enabling the reduction of carbon.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the biodiversity value of the wood in Lackabawn, Millstreet in the MS GB 2 be protected?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes it is considered that the Lackabawn woods should be mentioned within MS-GO-03.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.4.16</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kathy O'Sullivan</b>
<b>DCDP345932143</b>	DCDP345932143
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission raises a number of issues regarding the proposed Regeneration Sites in the town, suggests improvements to community/town facilities and infrastructure in the town. Regarding MM REGEN 02 the Bus Depot in Mart Area, the submission suggests a small road running parallel to Main Street to avoid a different exit point for buses with a reuse of the building in the centre of the depot as a small railway museum / waiting room for passengers. The submission suggests that MM REGEN 04 North of Market Square could be wonderful café venue, with occasional art or photography exhibitions with an arts and crafts focus. The submission MM REGEN 06 Existing Fire Station would be better to have a more sensitive use regarding both its historical context and to also reflect the fact that it has always been used by the youth of the town.

	<p>Regarding community facilities, the submission notes that a day care centre for the elderly or those with dementia and increased GP services to support the growing population are required. In addition, the submission suggests that the refurbishment of the Briery Gap would be more in keeping with the heritage and history of the town and in addition, to facilitate a walk on all the grounds contained within the Castle, along the sides of the golf course, both top and bottom sections. It is also noted that riverside walks would need to be developed in a very sensitive manner, as otherwise, the beauty and atmosphere of the area would be spoiled. The submission supports Bealick Mill as an excellent location for a town museum/interpretive centre and notes that while there is no retail core, that existing premises should be encouraged to have brightly painted exteriors with traditional signage (using calligraphy, Irish language etc.). The submission advises that the footpaths may not be in good condition for users of buggies and wheelchairs and notes also that there was a missed opportunity to include a cycle lane on the By-pass and that a) it is narrow and b) emerges at the western end of the town at a point that is traditionally very icy in winter. The submission notes that greater consultation needs to be had with those who have lived in the town for generations and know it well, when it comes to any proposed development.</p> <p>It is also noted that until the issues of water supply and waste water management are dealt with that no further development can happen. It is also noted that flooding is a huge issue in the town, and suggests that consultation on this issue needs to be more meaningful with the local residents.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the plan include in objective MM REGEN 02 the Bus Depot in Mart Area, provision for a small road running parallel to Main Street to avoid a different exit point for buses with a reuse of the building in the centre of the depot as a small railway museum / waiting room for passengers?</li> <li>2. Can MM REGEN 04 North of Market Square include provision for a café venue, with occasional art or photography exhibitions with an arts and crafts focus?</li> <li>3. Should MM REGEN 06 Existing Fire Station have a more sensitive use regarding both its historical context and to also reflect the fact that it has always been used by the youth of the town?</li> <li>4. Can the plan provide for the elderly or those with dementia and increase GP services to support the growing population?</li> <li>5. Should the refurbishment of the Briery Gap be more in keeping with the heritage and history of the town?</li> <li>6. Can the walks be extended particularly along both sides of the Golf Course?</li> <li>7. Riverside walks need to be developed in a sensitive manner</li> <li>8. Can the Bealick Mill be promoted as an excellent location for a town museum/interpretive centre?</li> <li>9. Can the CDP address the improvements of footpaths in the town and the design and alignment of the of N22 By-pass?</li> <li>10. Can further development occur in the absence of water supply and wastewater management issues being resolved?</li> <li>11. How has the flooding in the town been addressed in the CDP?</li> </ol>

<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that this type of development could be accommodated in the proposed objective for the Bus Depot Site. Any development proposals will need to come from Bus Eireann / Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII).</li> <li>2. Yes, it is considered that those uses would fit in with the proposed development objective for the site, however the site needs to be amended to include the former Church of Ireland Church.</li> <li>3. Yes, given the surrounding context contiguous to the main ACA in Macroom, it is proposed to MM REGEN 06 Existing Fire Station have a sensitive use regarding both its historical context and to also reflect the fact that it has always been used by the youth of the town.</li> <li>4. Volume One of the CDP contains two chapters of particular note here, Chapter 4 Housing which makes special provision for housing for and Aging Population and in addition, Chapter 6 Social and Community which makes provision for medical services. The availability of GP services is however outside of the scope of the CDP process itself.</li> <li>5. The refurbishment of the Briery Gap is the subject of a separate planning application and will be determined accordingly by the Planning Authority.</li> <li>6. Yes, it is considered that MM-GO-09 and 10 make provision for improved, safe pedestrian and cyclist connectivity including the provision of new footpaths or improvement of existing footpaths as appropriate in a sensitive manner</li> <li>7. Agreed. See above</li> <li>8. It is considered that the Bealick Mill, in the Tourism and Placemaking and Public Realm sections of the Macroom chapter of Volume 4.</li> <li>9. Yes, see reply to Issue 6 above. In addition, the design of the National Primary Network is a matter for TII and outside the scope of this plan.</li> <li>10. Yes, this is agreed, for an updated position regarding water services see Proposed Amendment. 4.4.1.8 Macroom</li> <li>11. The SFRA (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) has been updated and a series of proposed amendments are set out in this document.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.11</li> <li>3. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.11</li> <li>4. No Amendment Required</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required</li> <li>6. No Amendment Required</li> <li>7. No Amendment Required</li> <li>8. No Amendment Required</li> <li>9. No Amendment Required</li> <li>10. No Amendment Required Refer to Proposed Amendment. 4.4.1.8 Macroom</li> <li>11. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.7</li> </ol>
<p><b>Interested Party</b></p>	<p><b>Ken Harte, Dr.</b></p>

<b>DCDP342195773</b>	DCDP342195773
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission supports the ambition to consolidate the village cores of Ovens and Killumney however it disagrees that they should be treated as one settlement within the draft plan arguing that they are markedly different in character with Ovens in particular representing a transition into a rural context and also given the proposed N22 which dissects the settlements. The submission in noting the lack of drainage infrastructure in particular, suggests that it is logical to reduce the area of the Ovens development boundary and proposes that the western edge of the zoned lands KO-R-04 should be redrawn as the development boundary of the settlement of Ovens. The submission in identifying this new proposed development boundary notes that this would exclude seven existing houses from within the boundary as it argues that they are rural in nature.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should Killumney/Ovens be treated as one settlement?</li> <li>2. Can the development boundary of Ovens be reduced?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, it is considered that Killumney and Ovens share services, facilities and amenities and this gives the combined locations a critical mass to achieve appropriate population growth in line with the necessary social and physical infrastructure. It is particularly noteworthy also given its employment role.</li> <li>2. It is not considered that this development boundary should be reduced as it will provide for a consolidated core around Eire Óg GAA facility and the Ovens primary school. It is also considered that the undeveloped lands to the south of this core should remain within the development boundary in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lorcan Tiernan and Joe O'Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346253269</b>	DCDP346253269
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The purpose of this submission is to request an extension of the settlement development boundary of Killumney / Ovens to the southeast to include a site of about 11 Ha which the submission proposes is a suitable location to provide housing and an Integrated Care Village. The submission suggests that “existing residential”, “mixed residential and other uses” or “residential areas” would be a suitable zoning to achieve this development.</p> <p>The submission provides a context for the lands, noting that they are strategically located with direct access to the N22 and provides a detailed planning policy assessment of the role of Killumney / Ovens in meeting the population growth requirements of the CDP. In addition the submission also sets out the context for the support and provision of housing options for our aging population in the CDP and also notes that qualitatively and economically, extended independent living graduating to supported independent living with an option for residential care is most viable and the submission states that the provision of an integrated care village as part of this proposal is underpinned by current relevant national planning policies. Indeed, the submission outlines in detail the long term care</p>

	<p>market in Cork, the geographic/ demographic location, community integration possibilities, transport links (CMATS Bus Connect Route) as well as an assessment of supply / demand which it states all point to the positive economic viability of this proposal.</p> <p>The submission provides an assessment of the public transport, walking and cycling potential of this location and how the provision of the distributor route to the west also provides for pedestrian and vehicular arteries extending from the village centre. The submission also provides a detailed proposed conceptual scheme design which provides for four mini neighbourhoods, a north south orientated formal park and an east-west feeder road incorporating pedestrian and bicycle footpaths which dissect the site. Within the conceptual scheme design densities of Medium B and Medium C are proposed providing for about 250 2, 3, 4 bedroom homes and apartments and the development and a 100 bed dementia care centre with step down units. The submission outlines all of the supporting services which would be provided in line with best practice for such facilities.</p> <p>Finally, the submission appends a letter of support from a potential Care Village / Nursing Home provider, a pre connection enquiry to Irish Water which states that the proposed connection to the Irish Water network can be facilitated at this time and further analysis as mentioned previously regarding the viability of the proposal. The submission states that this proposal provides both and opportunity to develop the first and benchmark integrated Care Village setting in the county, while also meeting housing demand in the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Killumney/Ovens?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The points made in this submission are all noted. The draft plan made provision for 424 overall units in Killumney Ovens on about 23 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. The lands zoned in Killumney Ovens all have permission and are considered pending wastewater improvements to be shovel ready. There is sufficient land zoned in Killumney Ovens to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such consolidated development and in accordance with National Policy and Guidelines. See Volume One of this report for further detail.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Loretto O'Regan</b>
<b>DCDP346194785</b>	DCDP346194785
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that lands are included within the Killumney development boundary with a zoning objective of 'Existing / mixed Residential and other uses' to facilitate the delivery of the ambitious 2028 population target for the village.</p> <p>The submission states that the area is north of the existing Killumney</p>

	development boundary and outside of the N22 corridor and the submitter intends to apply for the area inside the development boundary in the next few weeks. The submitter also states that she has a letter from the NRA/TII stating that they have no concern regarding anything outside of the N22 corridor.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the development boundary of Killumney Ovens be amended slightly to include the remainder of a field?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. Notwithstanding the point raised in the submission regarding the proposed N22 Corridor, TII in their submission have raised this issue and state that rezoning proposals should not have the effect of altering the function of these routes / improvements schemes or importantly, increase the cost of land to be acquired or under active consideration as a route option of a national road scheme, Such proposals while potentially bringing major financial gains to the property owners involved, would be at variance with the broader public interest and would, by significantly increasing the cost of the land to be acquired for road scheme, reduce the funding available to the Authority for road construction and improvement work generally. In addition, Section 2.9 of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines also advise that development of local area plan should identify land required for future national road projects including objectives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain required lands free from development and</li> <li>• Ensure that measures are put in place so that any adjacent development of sensitive uses, such as housing, schools and nursing homes are compatible with the construction and long-term operation of the road.</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore considered inappropriate and contrary to National Policy to include these lands within the development boundary.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Marilene Dawson</b>
<b>DCDP344807479</b>	DCDP344807479
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests the zoning of about 0.50 Ha of agricultural / green field lands to build an eco-home at Ballyshoneen, Waterfall. In noting the policies contained in the NPF, the submission suggests that there is a major development challenge in harnessing the development potential of these small rural villages on the one hand, while protecting these resources for essentially local or rurally derived housing needs on the other and further states that a singular dwelling house would not affect the development potential for other applicants who wish to settle in the near future. The submission sets out the planning, design and servicing rationale for the proposed zoning and notes that there are no built or natural heritage reasons (NIAH, RPS, ACA, or NHA, SPA and SAC) which might prevent such zoning.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the Rural Housing Policies be amended?

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. The rural housing policy of the Draft Plan is based on the Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities published in 2005 which remain in force. The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage have indicated that new guidelines are being prepared to address rural housing issues and to take account of the Flemish Decree, the National Planning Framework and broader settlement context. Amongst other things it is anticipated that these guidelines will provide essential guidance on issues such as equal access to rural housing having regard to the freedom of movement across the EU, defining demonstrable social and economic need, identifying areas under urban pressure, and assessing the viability of town and villages. In the absence of new guidelines it is not feasible to reconcile the approach of the NPF with the detailed approach set out in the current guidelines which advocate that people who are part of the rural community should be accommodated there. The Council is therefore deferring a review of the rural housing policy of the plan until such time as guidelines are available to inform the review. See also Volume 1, of this report for further discussion on this issue</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Marilene Dawson</b>
<b>DCDP345122774</b>	DCDP345122774
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This is a duplicate submission please refer to DCDP344807479.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	This is a duplicate submission please refer to DCDP344807479.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a duplicate submission please refer to DCDP344807479.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	This is a duplicate submission please refer to DCDP344807479.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Horgan</b>
<b>DCDP338753125</b>	DCDP338753125
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the development boundary of Kilmurry village is extended to include a plot of land which is adjacent to the current development boundary extending southwards from the Village. The submission notes that Kilmurry has expanded to the south with a play school and the GAA grounds further south on the same public road that abuts this plot. It is argued that this is a very busy stretch of road and it is hoped that by expanding the development boundary of the village that infrastructure like foot paths and public lighting to access the play school and the GAA pitch will be greatly improved with further housing extending in this direction. The submission makes reference to other lands and property currently being renovated which are owned by the submitter in the village.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Kilmurry?



<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan makes provision for 5 units within the development boundary of Kilmurry. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Matt O'Mahony &amp; Associates Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345231978</b>	DCDP345231978
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission relates to lands (7.12ha) north of the river and Macroom Town Centre at Mill Road. The lands are currently within the green belt and the submission requests that they be zoned for Business and General Employment and that an objective to provide a bridge connection between Mart area south of the river, and the Mill road north of the river, be reinstated in the plan. Submission notes the land is inside the bypass, within a ten-minute walk of the town centre, is close to services and transport links, and would support the compact growth and economic development of the town. The Draft Plan also includes an objective to improve the Mill Road. Submission references national, regional and local planning policy in support of the submission and notes Macroom's role as the largest town within the Municipal District. Submission further notes that other employment lands zoned in the plan are further removed from the town centre. Development of these lands would support the population and economic growth of the town.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the boundary of Macroom town be extended to include more land for business and employment use?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lands have been specifically zoned for employment use in the draft plan and there are other opportunities within the established use zonings and the town centre to accommodate employment uses. A commitment is being given, as part of the amendments to Volume One of the Plan (Chapter 8 Economic Development) to undertake a review of the supply of employment land across the county within two years of the plan being adopted. The need for additional land in Macroom can be considered as part of this process.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>McCarthy Family and the McCarthy Trust</b>
<b>DCDP346175501</b>	DCDP346175501
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission objects to the extent of the Green Infrastructure zoning in Killumney-Ovens [KO-GC-02] and indicates lands which it requests to be excluded from this zoning objective. The submission outlines the intent of the family to apply for four sites on this land and notes that it was with this development in mind that the sewage treatment plant for the adjacent</p>

	Grange Manor development was allowed on these lands in 2001/2002. The submission outlines the sheltered nature of the lands, the extent of servicing available and their accessibility from an existing established entrance. In conclusion, the submission states that the family have no objection to the zoning of the remainder of their lands also identified in the submission being included in the KO-GC-02, once the requested portion is removed to allow for four local qualifying family members.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the boundary of KO-GC-02 be amended to reflect the new flood boundary as set out in the SFRA?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. While the Planning Authority notes that the Flood Zone area has reduced following the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, it is considered that this area is of high ecological value including a river corridor and mature trees and the boundary should not be changed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Crowley</b>
<b>DCDP346171682</b>	DCDP346171682
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that lands included within the KO-GC-02 as Green Infrastructure be reverted to 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses'. The submission notes that as evidenced by the Lee CMATS mapping, the flood risk zone from the River Bride in this area is confined to south of the river and would therefore not impact on the subject site. In noting the national, regional and local planning policies for the area including the ambitious population and housing targets proposed for Killumney Ovens, and also noting the reduction in the overall development boundary for the settlement(s), it is argued that the proposed zoning and development boundary amendment will contribute directly towards the realisation of the vision for the settlement to consolidate its form and support growth appropriate to its status as a Key Village.</p> <p>The submission also proposes that while this submission focuses on the strip of land to the south of the N22 Corridor, the wider land holding (totalling 40 Ha) identified in the submission including part of the N22 Corridor and lands north of the Corridor in Ovens have potential connectivity enhancements which would contribute towards the delivery of a cycle route extension from the Ballincollig Regional Park to Killumney/Ovens which could be proposed through positive partnership between the landowner and Cork County Council.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the boundary of KO-GC-02 be amended to reflect the new flood boundary as set out in the SFRA?</li> <li>2. Can additional lands be included within the development boundary including lands within the N22 Route Corridor.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. While the Planning Authority notes that the Flood Zone area has reduced following the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, it is considered that this area is of high ecological value including a river corridor and mature trees and the boundary should not be changed.

	<p>2. This is a substantial land holding of 40 Ha much of which is located within the existing development boundary. Notwithstanding the points raised in the submission regarding the proposed N22 Corridor, TII in their submission to the draft plan have raised this issue stating that development strategic or rezoning proposals should not have the effect of altering the function of these routes / improvements schemes or importantly, increase the cost of land to be acquired or under active consideration as a route option of the national road scheme. Such proposals while potentially bringing major financial gains to the property owners involved, would be at variance with the broader public interest and would, by significantly increasing the cost of the land to be acquired for road scheme, reduce the funding available to the Authority for road construction and improvement work generally. In addition, Section 2.9 of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines also advise that development of local area plan should identify land required for future national road projects including objectives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain required lands free from development and</li> <li>• Ensure that measures are put in place so that any adjacent development of sensitive uses, such as housing, schools and nursing homes are compatible with the construction and long term operation of the road.</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore considered in appropriate and contrary to National Policy to include these lands within the development boundary.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Milaqua Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346212371</b>	DCDP346212371
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes that a small site located immediately adjacent to both the Lios ns Fea housing development and the proposed development which is about to start construction (MM-R-04) be rezoned from passive open space to medium density housing. It is stated that the overall site has planning permission granted for 50 dwelling houses and that the proposed playground is to be relocated to accommodate the proposed housing development. It is stated that there is adequate green space to comply with the 12 to 18% requirements and that the proposal should have no effect on the passive open space or interfere with the Codrum Woods.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the CDP change the layout of an existing planning permission?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No, it is not possible to change the permitted layout of an existing planning permission through the development plan process. The site in question is included within MM-R-04 and is zoned for residential development.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Milmac Limited</b>

<b>DCDP346214222</b>	DCDP346214222
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands be rezoned from existing industry to residential on the Millstreet Road, Gurteenroe, Macroom. The submission states that the applicants previously were granted a material contravention to permit 14 no houses on industrial ground on the opposite side of the Millstreet Road which is now complete. The submission also argues that Millstreet Road is now becoming a vibrant residential area and is more suited to residential as opposed to industrial uses and that the proposed site has existing access onto Millstreet Road and direct connection to all services.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should these lands be rezoned from existing mixed/general business / industrial uses to residential uses?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that this area is a desirable pocket of employment uses in a key prominent location on the approach to the town from the west / Millstreet Road and that this is the best use at this location.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mullach na Réidh Teo &amp; Coiste Forbartha Réidh na nDoirí</b>
<b>DCDP344641404</b>	DCDP344641404
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the development boundary for Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) Gaeltacht village is included by name in the 2022-2088 Development plan. The settlement is identified as a Village Nuclei in the 2017 Local Area Plan.</p> <p>The submission sets out the wide ranging services available in the village, including the community centre, Ionad Áise, which provides a space for social activities, classes and remote working. The submission also notes that there are two vacant commercial sites, with three phase power, and their own water and sewerage disposal units situated only four miles from the N22 road. The submission notes the public transport, education, religious, sporting, and local services, including post office, shop, mobile library availability in the village. The submission argues that in order to maintain these facilities within this 'transitional area' that the village is included in the development plan. The submission notes that there is potential to encourage high quality jobs through the commercial serviced sites mentioned above and also notes that the village needs more housing but that this would require a public freshwater storage and distribution system.</p> <p>The submission proposes that the housing policy for transitional rural areas should include an extra clause to allow housing development in this area for those working in local factories, shops, hotels, cafés so that employees would not have to commute outwards from larger towns and it is suggested that this measure would actually reduce a lot of the pressure to build in larger more distant towns which are already under pressure to provide services for their own people. The submission proposes that up to 10 houses be allowed to be built in the surrounding area. The submission favours the promotion of solar energy panels over wind arguing that it</p>

	<p>would be of huge economic benefit and save the landscape from further destruction.</p> <p>The submission requests that Cork County Council recognise the Gaeltacht status of the village and the cultural, historical and tourism opportunities in the area connecting all the local villages from Ballyvourney to Cúil Aodha, Réidh na nDoirí, Béal Atha an Ghaorthaidh &amp; Cill na Martra. In addition, the submission proposes better lighting in the village area, with picnic tables and a playground for the community centre, and the development of a historical cottage as a tourism and heritage attraction together with cycleways and walkways.</p> <p>Submitter considers that the exclusion of settlements like Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) from the Plan will be detrimental for local people and rural areas generally and may cause the loss of local services, causing loneliness and desolation for many.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) be included on the list of settlements for the CDP?</li> <li>2. Should the housing policy for transitional rural areas include an extra clause to allow housing development in this area for those working in local factories?</li> <li>3. Can the CDP favour solar energy panels over wind?</li> <li>4. Can the CDP request that the Council recognise the Gaeltacht status of the village?</li> <li>5. Can the CDP propose additional facilities, community facilities, tourism and heritage attractions etc in this Gaeltacht area?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.</li> <li>2. The rural housing policy of the Draft Plan is based on the Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities published in 2005 which remain in force. The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage have indicated that new guidelines are being prepared to address rural housing issues and to take account of the Flemish Decree, the National Planning Framework and broader settlement context. Amongst other things it is anticipated that these guidelines will provide essential guidance on issues such as equal access to rural housing having regard to the freedom of movement across the EU, defining demonstrable social and economic need, identifying areas under urban pressure, and assessing the viability of town and villages. In the absence of new guidelines it is not feasible to reconcile the approach of the NPF with the detailed approach set out in the current guidelines which advocate that people who are part of the</li> </ol>

	<p>rural community should be accommodated there. The Council is therefore deferring a review of the rural housing policy of the plan until such time as guidelines are available to inform the review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. No, it is not for the CDP to favour one particular type of renewable energy over another but rather to provide policy guidance on the most appropriate locations for such projects in accordance with National Policy and Guidance.</li> <li>4. Yes, it is considered that the Gaeltacht areas need further prominence in the plan and amendment Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.2.2 makes reference to Macroom's role as a 'Baile Serviseacha' or Gaeltacht service town and other proposed amendments regarding our cultural heritage in Chapter 16 are also proposed. See Volume 1, of this document.</li> <li>5. The CDP proposes a wide range of Tourism and cultural objectives for the county generally and section 10.6 'Protection of Tourist Assets' mentions specifically 'The Gaeltacht areas which are of significant cultural heritage value and frequently visited by tourists'.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required.</li> <li>4. Refer to Proposed Amendment No. 4.4.2.2 and other Proposed Amendments for Chapter 16, Built and Cultural Heritage.</li> <li>5. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Neilie O'Callaghan</b>
<b>DCDP346237590</b>	DCDP346237590
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the development boundary at Dripsey Lower to include the existing West County Hotel to be zoned for short term holiday letting and also to include 7 acres for serviced sites.</p> <p>The submission notes that the site is immediately adjacent to the River Lee and that there is demand for short term letting in this area. It also sets out the topography and servicing, for the development, including the proposal for serviced sites which would be serviced by Treatment Units and Polishing Filters. It states that the wooded area on site would provide screening and that there is potential for road frontage off a quiet road for safe access. It also notes that Dripsey is under severe pressure from one off housing.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the CDP zone these lands for short term holiday accommodation?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These lands are located in the Green Belt well outside the development boundary of Dripsey Lower. Future development proposals will need to take the scale of the existing uses into consideration, along with the ecological, infrastructural, services and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Noel and Aideen Creedon</b>

DCDP346243975	DCDP346243975
<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>This submission relates to about 3.22 Ha of lands in the northwest of Macroom requesting that they be omitted from the greenbelt designation and brought into the development boundary and zoned for Medium B Density Residential Development.</p> <p>The submission further notes that a portion of the subject lands are zoned for residential development in the existing Macroom Town Development Plan 2009 (as extended and varied) but that it is proposed to be de-zoned in the Draft Plan and designated as Greenbelt.</p> <p>The submission proposes that additional residential sites are required to ensure there are sufficient sites zoned to meet the projected populations targets for Macroom as set out in the Draft Plan. The submission also provides a National, Regional and Local Planning Framework emphasising the potential and growth context for Macroom including that proposed in the Draft CDP. The submission argues that the Core Strategy in setting out a target population for 4,980 is assuming an average households size of 3 persons when in actual fact the average household size in Macroom was 2.5 persons and therefore there is a deficit of about 87 housing units. The submission goes on to state that the Council has over-estimated the number of units that will come forward within the built-up area (120) during the plan period, which it states in turn reduces the amount of land to be zoned for future residential development. Further to this point the submission outlines that following on from the County Council's Urban Capacity Study, that there is strong likelihood is that not all of the identified opportunities (308 units) will come forward for development and it should be assumed that a reasonable proportion will not come forward, certainly during the period of the emerging plan and this should be incorporated into the County Council's thinking on how much land to zone for residential going forward.</p> <p>The submission requests clarification in respect of any on going proposed works to upgrading the water supply network.</p> <p>The submission provides an analysis of the proposed residential sites, noting that while R-01 has permission, it is questionable whether R-02, R-03 or R-04 will come forward for development during the plan period and provides a critique of each site. The submission states that the subject site is fully serviceable and benefits from existing footpath provision and connectivity to Macroom Town Centre unlike other sites that are coming forward for residential zoning and the submission states that there is simply no consistency in the Council's zoning or retention of residential lands in the emerging County Plan.</p> <p>In addition the submission sets out the key criteria set out in the Development Plan Guidance, including need, policy context, capacity, supporting infrastructure etc and all of these matters are set out and justified in the submission which also notes that this subject site, provides an opportunity to deliver a substantial residential development contiguous to the existing built-up area on a site which adjoins an existing housing estate, Ros Alainn and includes an access road from this existing estate up to the boundary of the subject site.</p> <p>Finally, the submission notes that part of the overall landholding was CPO'd for the proposed Macroom Bypass, and it is suggested that this will act as a natural boundary for the town.</p>



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential land in Macroom?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The points made in this submission are all noted and regarding the points on household size, a revised amendment has been produced which sets out a more simplified approach to house hold size at a county level in accordance with the draft Development Plan Guidelines. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission, although contiguous to the development boundary and small in nature are considered to be more remote from the town centre and therefore cannot be considered for development.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Odassa Developments Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344618328</b>	DCDP344618328
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to a site owned by Odassa Developments Ltd., at Carrigane, Ovens Co. Cork The site received planning permission in February 2021 for 9 no. residential serviced sites (Ref. 20/6720). The site is within the development boundary of Killumney Ovens in the 2017 LAP but is outside the boundary in the Draft Plan. The site is on the northern side of the N22 adjacent to Ballincollig. This submission requests that the site be re-instated within the development boundary in the final adopted Development Plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should lands north of the N22 and west of the city boundary be reinstated as part of the development boundary of Killumney Ovens?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. These lands are located north of the N22, west of Ballincollig and do not read as part of the settlement of Killumney Ovens. No change to the boundary is proposed. Planning permission has been granted for a small housing development on the land the subject of the submission and this can proceed irrespective of the proposed change in the status of the site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Leary &amp; O'Sullivan Developments and Liam Jones</b>
<b>DCDP345951749</b>	DCDP345951749

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests an extension of the Courtbrack development boundary to include c.4.75ha in area and are situated to the south of the existing village development boundary, adjacent to the recently completed Drom Slí housing estate. It is stated that the main purpose of this submission is to highlight the ongoing failure to address the long-standing decline of small urban settlements within the county as a result of both the current crisis in housing supply across the county and the continued unchecked development of unsustainable one-off housing, and the submission requests a comprehensive review of the established settlement boundaries of same as part of a new overall strategy to reverse these trends.</p> <p>In addition, the submission provides a policy background from the National, Regional and Local level plans and National Policy Guidelines citing the general planning advice note and the development of 'Small Towns and Villages'.</p> <p>The submission is also accompanied by a flood study of Fiddlers Brook on behalf of O'Leary &amp; O'Sullivan Developments in Courtbrack as part of their submission to the then Draft Indicative Flood Extent Maps which were published in the Draft Local Area Plans in 2011.</p> <p>The submission states that the subject lands are currently designated as part of a 'Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence' and are not on a scenic route, nor do they form part of a high value landscape and are not subject to environmental, ecological, built heritage or any other natural heritage designations. It is further stated that the proposed scale of development should be reviewed and modified given that all service and infrastructure requirements to facilitate same are already in place, and the submission notes that this is something not evident in other villages throughout the district and the wider county.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Courtbrack?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan makes provision for 10 units within the development boundary of Courtbrack, part of the rationale for this is that there is no capacity for drinking water (2021 Assessment) as outlined in the draft plan. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pat Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP344355605</b>	DCDP344355605
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission argues for an increase in the development boundary on the Coolacullig Road to the north of the village of Coachford. The submission argues that due to the current housing crisis and demand for housing and due to the settlement's proximity to employment hubs in</p>

	Ballincollig, Cork City and Little Island, and its improving water and waste water services, providing for up to 1600 people that the plan needs to be more ambitious for this settlement.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Coachford?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The plan makes provision for a reduced number of units (95) within the development boundary of Coachford, as outlined in the amendments to the draft plan (see Volume 1, Core Strategy Amendments for more detail on this). It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pat O'Riordan</b>
<b>DCDP344001108</b>	DCDP344001108
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that additional lands to the north west are included within the boundary of Coachford Village. The submission argues that given the vast improvement to the water service availability in Coachford and its location, both its proximity to Cork City and in the Lee Valley that there is scope to accommodate extra dwellings for tourism and hospitality purposes and that the settlement area should be increased. It is noted that the proposed area is within walking distance of the local primary school & secondary school, which is currently being expanded to allow for an increased number of pupils. The submission also argues that this would be in line with Project Ireland 2040 which aims to strengthen rural economies and communities and argues that the increased settlement area would serve the community well.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Coachford?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The plan makes provision for a reduced number of units (95) within the development boundary of Coachford, as outlined in the amendments to the draft plan (see Volume 1, Core Strategy Amendments for more detail on this). It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Patrick Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345616597</b>	DCDP345616597

<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that an additional parcel of land located between the Macroom Civic Amenity Site and the Hotel to the west of the town be zoned for Commercial and Industrial or Residential (Mixed) uses and included within the development boundary of Macroom. The submission notes that this site previously had permission for a Caravan Park and Camp Site and Recreation / Toilet Block and a further permission for a Petrol Filling Station. The submission states that the owner of the site is hoping to lodge a Planning Application in the near future for its development depending on the zoning in the County Development Plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential/mixed uses sites in Macroom?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission, although contiguous to the development boundary are located in an area considered to be very remote from the town centre and therefore the inclusion of such lands would not facilitate or contribute to the orderly development of Macroom town and is out of line with National Policy and Guidance on this issue. <i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Peter and Catherine O'Shea</b>
<b>DCDP345947303</b>	DCDP345947303
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests the extension of the development boundary of Upper Dripsey to include lands about 0.6 ha in area to the rear of the existing filling station immediately adjacent to the south-western development boundary of the village along the River Dripsey. The submission notes that the lands include c.22m of road frontage where street planting has been incorporated along this stretch of the public road. In identifying the National, Regional policy regarding the current housing crisis and the development of smaller towns and villages, and previous County and Local Area Plans for County and particularly those for Upper Dripsey, this submission suggests that the lands, located adjacent to an existing built up urban area (situated between established residential and commercial buildings), represent a fundamentally more appropriate location for development than sites within the open countryside and can help the settlement achieve its proposed scale of development while also consolidating the built up area in a manner that would strengthen the village's core, which the submission states is entirely in line with the proposed Draft Plan policies.

	<p>The submission notes that previous applications for redevelopment of the filling station site itself have been refused, as it was considered that the redevelopment of the site would result in over development or a compromised layout however, it is also noted that the application assessment did note the potential of the site to become a focal point in the village and that the existing building is not visually appealing, and that its redevelopment is to be welcomed.</p> <p>The submission also notes that previous applications for development in the area have established there are no ecological or hydrological links with any designated European Sites and that the opportunity exists to extend the existing objective (GR-02) for a walkway along the river Dripsey through the lands and on to the main public road, providing for a loop walk within the village.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Upper Dripsey?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft plan makes provision for 5 units within the development boundary of Upper Dripsey, given the capacity issues with wastewater system. However this proposal, part of which is already included within the development boundary of Upper Dripsey, would improve the approach to the village considerably it is considered that it would also allow for more compact growth in the settlement and the implementation of walks which are already identified on the zoning map.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.24.1</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Richard Balfe</b>
<b>DCDP344149733</b>	DCDP344149733
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks the development of a greenway consisting of a 2.5km protected cycleway to run adjacent to the R584 road from Hartnett's Cross out to the Gearagh Nature Reserve. The submission states that such a greenway is in keeping with recommendations and requirements highlighted in the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 and quotes objectives and sections of the Plan (Objective No. MM-R-01 and MM-GO-06 specifically), in support of the proposal noting that Macroom itself is predicted to see substantial growth in population, housing and completion of the N22 bypass.</p> <p>It is argued that the proposed greenway would provide a safe, scenic and high quality cycle and walking route from the town of Macroom to the Gearagh enhanced by the development of connections from proposed relief roads to the town which should incorporate plans for active travel, including active travel for the many employed in the area in Wright Medical (Stryker) and Danone Nutricia. The submission also references the 2017 "Sports Ireland Trails - Classifications &amp; Grading for Recreational Trails" – noting the importance of rest areas, pocket recreation areas linking with historical and environmental importance of the Gearagh. The submission also notes that this proposal would also support the</p>

	developing a sense of pride of place, encouraging healthy active living in the local community and provide a major boost for both local and international tourism.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can a new Greenway be proposed from Hartnett's Cross out to the Gearagh Nature Reserve?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that this proposal is covered under MM-GO-06, as the submission states, but also MM-GO-09 and MM-GO-10. It is therefore proposed in the first instance to include mention of this greenway in MM-GO-09 should an opportunity arise over the lifetime of the plan to investigate the possibility of a feasibility study which would look into the viability of such a scheme and this would be promoted through the Municipal Districts and Transportation Departments in the first instance.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.13
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ruden Homes Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345987661</b>	DCDP345987661
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to a Ruden Homes site in Ovens and welcomes the retained zoning of their site for existing residential / mixed residential and other uses, and the recognition in the draft plan of the permission on their lands, which the company are actively progressing. However, as the remaining permitted units may not all be constructed within the life of the current permission (December 2021), it is requested that Table 4.4.13 of the plan recognises this and that the table is adjusted accordingly to reflect the estimated units yield from the built footprint within the plan period up to 2028. Submission further requests that the plan acknowledges that the site is fully serviced and that paragraphs 4.6.11 and 4.6.12 of the plan do not apply to their site. Submission further welcomes the removal of the "Normal Recommended Scale of any individual scheme" in the draft plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	This submission refers to a Ruden Homes site in Ovens and welcomes the retained zoning of their site for existing residential / mixed residential and other uses, and the recognition in the draft plan of the permission on their lands, which the company are actively progressing. However, as the remaining permitted units may not all be constructed within the life of the current permission (December 2021), it is requested that Table 4.4.13 of the plan recognises this and that the table is adjusted accordingly to reflect the estimated units yield from the built footprint within the plan period up to 2028. Submission further requests that the plan acknowledges that the site is fully serviced and that paragraphs 4.6.11 and 4.6.12 of the plan do not apply to their site. Submission further welcomes the removal of the "Normal Recommended Scale of any individual scheme" in the draft plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Does the plan need to be amended to reflect the serviced nature of a specific site in Ovens? 2. Does table 4.4.13 of the Macroom Municipal District Plan need to be amended to note outstanding permissions on a site in Ovens?
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. The lands the subject of this permission are zoned 'existing residential / mixed residential and other uses' and have planning permission.

	<p>2. Any future applications for permission on the land will be considered on their merits as part of the development management process in accordance with the provisions of the plan.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ruden Homes Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP346217956</b>	DCDP346217956
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission from Ruden Homes concerns land within the development boundary of Crookstown village. Planning permission was granted for 170 units on the land in 2007. No development has taken place. Following the publication of the Flood Risk Guidelines in 2009, the lands were subsequently identified as being at risk of flooding in the Local Area Plan. Submission indicates that Ruden Homes / Arup have completed a flood risk assessment and established that flood risk issues on site can be addressed / managed to acceptable levels, and the flood zone map in the LAP significantly overestimates the flood risk.</p> <p>In response to water services constraints in Crookstown, Ruden Homes proposes to connect into the wastewater treatment plan in Cloughduv, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional loading. This investment would create capacity for development in Crookstown. Submission requests that the Council recognise this opportunity to overcome the infrastructural issues in Crookstown and the high threshold costs associated with the solution.</p> <p>Submission requests that the plan recognise that the development of the Ruden Homes site complies with flood guidance and provides the opportunity to resolve the infrastructure issues in Crookstown. Given the costs of the works needed to deliver the development, it would only be viable if the housing target for the village is increased so more houses can be built. Submission requests that it be increased to 120 units and that paragraph 5.1.23 of the current LAP be reinstated in the draft Development Plan to allow for permissions to be granted for up to 120 additional dwelling units during the plan period subject to an agreed phasing programme and provided water services infrastructure and flood risk constraints are resolved to the Council's satisfaction. A detailed flood risk assessment report accompanies the submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does Crookstown village continue to be impacted by a risk of flooding?</li> <li>2. Should the scale of development proposed for Crookstown be increased?</li> <li>3. Should the plan be amended to support development in Crookstown on the basis of effluent from Crookstown being treated by the plant in Cloughduv?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The updated flood risk map for Crookstown indicates that large parts of the village, and the public roads accessing the village, continue to be a risk of flooding – flood zone A and B. The lands the subject of this submission are partially in Zone A flood risk and more generally within zone B. These are greenfield lands and the guidelines on flood risk management indicated that</li> </ol>



	<p>residential development should be <u>avoided</u> in areas at risk of flooding (Zone A and Zone B). Ample other lands, that are not at risk of flooding, are available throughout the Municipal District to cater for new housing development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the extent of flood risk impacting the village it is considered that there is no requirement to increase the scale of growth allocated to the village.</li> <li>Having regard to details of (1) and (2) above, it is considered that there is no requirement to support new development of a scale that would necessitate the diversion of wastewater effluent from Crookstown to Cloughduv.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendment required</li> <li>No amendment required</li> <li>No amendment required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Saorlaith Ní Shuibhne</b>
<b>DCDP337579937</b>	DCDP337579937
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to Baile Mhic Ire / Baile Bhuirne (Ballymakeery / Ballyvourney) and requests that a number of corrections are made to text of the document - Volume 4 - as follows: (1) Paragraph 4.8.17 remove mention of garda station as there is no longer a garda station in the area. (2) Paragraph 4.8.17 replace Coláiste Ghobnatan with Coláiste Íosagáin. (3) States that U-03 is a duplicate of U-02 and should be removed.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the CDP be amended to update and correct these issues?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, these issues will be noted, and amended.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.8.6 and 4.4.8.7 (3) <b>nonmaterial change in the final plan.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sean and Eileen Vaughan</b>
<b>DCDP345389862</b>	DCDP345389862
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the settlement of Reananerree (Ré na nDoirí) is included in the County Development Plan in order to maintain and enhance the existing amenities/ businesses, to create new business opportunities and community amenities in the area and grant planning for new dwelling houses.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can Réidh na nDoirí (Reananerree) be included on the list of settlements for the CDP?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.</li> </ol>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Siobhan Lankford</b>
<b>DCDP346055348</b>	DCDP346055348
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that about 3 hectares of lands in Knockanemore, Ovens be included within the development boundary of Killumney Ovens and that Knockanemore House and grounds existing use as 'primarily residential' area be reflected on the lands.</p> <p>The submission notes that the inclusion of these lands is based on a sound planning rationale as it would better define the settlement boundary and be more reflective of the existing extent of contiguous built-up area in the settlement and also contribute towards the consolidation of the settlement and the provision of a more cohesive and defined boundary which will enable a sustainable, plan-led approach to the future development of these lands. The submission notes that while the subject site is outside the flood risk zone of the River Bride, the southern portion of the lands fall within the 300m N22 Route Protection Corridor.</p> <p>The submission notes that past plans at local and county level have held the aspiration to address the existing fragmented nature of the settlement and that this is not consistent with the retention of the 300m N22 Route Protection Corridor, which has been the primary cause of this severance for the last 15 years. The submission argues that this undermines the coherent plan led development of the Key Village and also given the location of St Mary's Church which is a protected structure in close proximity to the site, the submission suggests that it is unrealistic to consider that the subject site will form part of the final route corridor. The submission also points that the NRDO have supported several recent planning permissions (the detail of which is given in the submission) which were granted within the corridor and conclude that a nuanced approach is more appropriate than the indefinite imposition of a rigid 300m Route Corridor.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can additional lands be included in the Ovens development boundary as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses'?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Notwithstanding the points raised in the submission regarding the proposed N22 Corridor and past planning applications, TII in their submission to the draft plan have raised this issue stating that development strategic or rezoning proposals should not have the effect of altering the function of these routes / improvements schemes or importantly, increase the cost of land to be acquired or under active consideration as a route option of the national road scheme. Such proposals while potentially bringing major financial gains to the property owners involved, would be at variance with the broader public interest and would, by significantly increasing the cost of the land to be acquired for road scheme, reduce the

	<p>funding available to the Authority for road construction and improvement work generally. In addition, Section 2.9 of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines also advise that development of local area plan should identify land required for future national road projects including objectives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain required lands free from development and</li> <li>• Ensure that measures are put in place so that any adjacent development of sensitive uses, such as housing, schools and nursing homes are compatible with the construction and long term operation of the road.</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore considered inappropriate and contrary to National Policy to include these lands within the development boundary.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Solas Financial</b>
<b>DCDP346050656</b>	DCDP346050656
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that lands to the north of Macroom town are zoned for residential uses. The lands, currently are currently zoned in the Macroom Town Development Plan for Business Industry and Technology Parks in the northern portions and Commercial / Retail to the south with a small portion of residential in the south eastern area and it is noted that a portion of the subject lands are zoned MM-B-01 in the proposed draft plan.</p> <p>It is suggested in the submission that there is a significant reliance on lands not available for development over the forth coming plan period and MM-R-01 is noted in this regard. It is also noted in the submission that these lands are significantly constrained by topographical challenges and that there is no formal planning history on the MM-R-02 or MM-R-03 lands. It is also stated that while it is noted that planning permission was granted for 46 residential units on the MM-R-04 lands, that they are 2 km by public footpath to the nearest part of the town centre.</p> <p>The submission states that the lands the subject of this submission are available, fully serviceable, and deliverable from a development perspective in the short term, and that they are located near to the town centre, social and community infrastructure as well as formal amenity space and it argues that they will more directly contribute to the achievement of compact growth. It is further proposed, that the delivery of MM-U-03, will be delivered commensurate with the planned development of the subject lands for residential purposes that the construction of this road upgrade will be developer led as outlined in the draft plan. It is also noted that it is a costly piece of infrastructure so that from a commercial viability perspective, it necessitates the zoning of all of the subject lands for residential purposes, and Medium A is proposed.</p> <p>The submission sets out the justification for allocating growth on the subject lands relative to the identified Principals set out in the RSES and concludes that the proposed zoning complies in full with these Principals. The submission also states that the developers have had initial discussions with the Planning Department (February 2021) who confirmed support in</p>

	Principal for the exploration of a material contravention procedure for a residential development but that due to the timing with the CDP Review a submission was encouraged. It is also noted in the submission that the developers who intend to build this development have a track record in providing a high quality product in Macroom and the Meadowlands development currently under construction is provided as an example of this.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need for zoning of additional residential/mixed uses sites in Macroom?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The draft plan made provision for 399 overall units in Macroom on about 12 ha of land which was zoned to cater for this. In addition, there are opportunities to deliver housing within the existing built footprint in order to deliver compact growth set by the NPF. Following publication of the Development Plan Guidelines in August, a further requirement for 3 Ha of land was identified as Additional Provision. So, the amendments to this plan now cater for this 3 Ha. The lands closest to the town centre core are identified in the first instance are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. The site the subject of this submission, is partly zoned for Business Uses and existing residential uses within the development boundary. It is considered that this use is the most suitable given its location allowing for employment uses within the 10 minute walking distance of the town and given the implications arising from the SFRA. <i>See Volume One of this report for further detail.</i>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Spillane Family</b>
<b>DCDP334074525</b>	DCDP334074525
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests the extension of the zoned area at Rathard, Kilbonane, Aherla. It is noted that this site is located approx. 1.3km to the south of the development boundary of Aherla and is within the Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should the existing development areas within the development boundary of Aherla be retained? Can the development boundary be further extended?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. This amended CDP makes provision for 10 units within the development boundary of Aherla. It is considered that there is ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary at this time. <i>See Volume One, of this report.</i>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>St. Colman's Boys' National School, Macroom.</b>
<b>DCDP333696753</b>	DCDP333696753
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission seeks an update of paragraph 4.3.22 of Volume 4 (Macroom MD) as it is stated that St. Colman's National School located from its previous location on Cork Street to a site to the south in 2009.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the CDP be amended to update and correct this issue?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Yes, this issue is noted and amended.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.3.14
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tadhg O'Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP346105850</b>	<b>DCDP346105850</b>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that lands (1.5 Ha) to the north east of Millstreet town, currently zoned for the provision of a nursing home (MS-X-02) be afforded the ZU 18-9 : Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses zoning objective and that the special policy objectives for the lands be omitted, in light of insufficient demand from the market at this location.</p> <p>The submission notes that originally, the MS-X-02 came about because of a submission requesting same to the then 2017 Local Area Plan. In addition, the submission also now argues that policy guidance with regard to residential care accommodation suggests a more central location in the settlement with greater access to amenities would be more suitable. The submission states that notwithstanding this position, that the lands are a sustainable and viable location within an established area of development in Millstreet where there is considerable policy support for further consolidation of the settlement.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the MS-X-02 zoning be removed from the zoning map and revert to 'Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses' ?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Yes, given the recent SFRA mapping for Millstreet it is proposed to remove the X-02 and change the designation on these lands to Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. Refer to Proposed Amendment 4.4.4.9
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ted Cook</b>
<b>DCDP346190222</b>	DCDP346190222
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission concerns a range of environmental and biodiversity issues. Firstly, the submission notes that while Cork County is vast (7,457 Square kms) that there are only 7 tree protection orders (TPOs) which apply, and in comparison, Co Wicklow which is 2,000 square km enjoys 70 TPOs. The submitter states that he has raised this issue over previous county development plan reviews and notes that in the absence of the TPO mechanism that no tree of outstanding beauty is protected by the Felling Licence in such zoned (county boroughs).

	<p>The submission states that roadside linear wildlife corridors and hedgerows legally protected by the Wildlife Act 1976 / 2000 are in an appalling condition and that contractors need to be educated about the best practice regarding each particular specimen and licensed by the County Council.</p> <p>Following on from this point, the submission notes that Ash Dieback has been discernible in the Blackwater and Lee Basins since 2016 and that this will accelerate unless an appropriate protocol is put in place with resistant specimens identified and mapped and that contractors and local communities have a critical role in this regard. It is further submitted that County Hall is best placed to coordinate this.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council's Japanese Knotweed control practices need to be given a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as there have been repeated and intensive spraying on the Sullane River banks which is upstream from the water works abstraction facility.</p> <p>Also, the submission states that under the Habitats Regulations the use of any regulated product within a Natura 2000 site is by self assessment but the submission states that using creosol a persistent bio accumulator through leachate impacts on water quality and the submission states that it will poison our 'Priority SAC Species'.</p> <p>The submission requests that County Hall undertakes a feasibility exercise on the merits of establishing a Local Authority Green Burial facility as the nearest facility seem to be in Co Wexford and notes that such choices are commonplace in UK and across Europe.</p> <p>The submission states that as access to planning applications are no longer available at local co engineers urban district offices but that a synopsis of the salient details should be available at local level with the aim of encouraging and supporting effective participation and achieving better outcomes.</p> <p>The submission concludes by commending Heritage Officer, and Senior Engineer in Macroom and states that the County Council's library service is exemplar.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the plan protect riparian corridors and implement TPOs?</li> <li>2. Does the CDP include policies to protect hedgerows?</li> <li>3. Can the CDP include policies regarding invasive species?</li> <li>4. Can the CDP promote a Local Authority Green Burial facility?</li> <li>5. Can the CDP improve access to planning applications at a local level?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan supports the protection of riparian corridors – see policy WM 11-11 which provides for the protection of riparian corridors. See policies BE 15-5(c) and (d) and also Policy 15-8. Developing a more detailed tree policy is a matter which will be considered when council commences work on the new County Biodiversity Action Plan. The council is also in the process of preparing a Roadside Boundary Management Policy. The policy is being developed taking account of the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan Transport Corridors Guidelines and with input from the Ecology Office of CCC.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. While it is desirable to protect trees, hedgerows and other habitats of high natural value, it is not always possible to retain all trees and hedgerows within new developments. Where hedgerows or trees have to be removed to make way for development, appropriate mitigation including planting of new trees or hedgerows is required. This is a standard CCC standard approach in planning policy and is provided for in Policy BE 15-6.</li> <li>3. Yes, the CDP includes policy: BE 15-7 Control of Invasive Species. Consideration will also be given to developing a more detailed invasive alien species policy as part of the process of developing the new County Biodiversity Action Plan.</li> <li>4. It is considered that this issue is outside the scope of the CDP Review.</li> <li>5. It is considered that this issue is outside the scope of the CDP Review.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Proposed.</li> <li>2. No Amendment Proposed.</li> <li>3. No Amendment Proposed.</li> <li>4. No Amendment Proposed.</li> <li>5. No Amendment Proposed.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ted Kelleher</b>
<b>DCDP335625722</b>	DCDP335625722
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests to include additional lands at Sleaven East, Macroom within the development boundary. The submission notes that the proposed new town development boundary runs right through the middle of the landholding and will, it argues effectively land lock the remaining part of this landholding. It is proposed that the existing tree line of the proposed site would form a natural end point to the development boundary for the town.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the plan be amended to include additional lands at Sleaven East to the south of the town?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land referenced in this submission is already included within the development boundary of Macroom in the published draft plan. The submission references an older map which is out of date.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ted Kelleher</b>
<b>DCDP345238371</b>	DCDP345238371
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests an extension to the development boundary of Coachford on the Coolacullig Road to the north. The submitter does not think that there is sufficient land within the proposed village boundary for the development of 116 houses and notes that the addition of the new waste water treatment plant in the village will improve the water services in the area and would serve the new houses.



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Coachford?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. The amendments to this plan make provision for up to 95 units within the development boundary of Coachford over the life of the plan. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tim O'Riordan</b>
<b>DCDP345228924</b>	DCDP345228924
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that lands are included within the Ballinagree development boundary to accommodate the growing demand for housing and given the insufficient land supply available currently. The submission argues that the lands are adjacent to the current boundary and have the benefit of water and waste water services. Regarding waste water services, the submission notes that currently there is not a high enough PE in the WWTP for it to operate efficiently. The submission also outlines a number of the educational, social, amenity, sport and recreation facilities as well as transport facilities, broadband and mobile phone coverage available in the village itself and in the surrounding area.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the CDP include Ballinagree and amend its development boundary?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. 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.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tracy Cronin</b>
<b>DCDP346138016</b>	DCDP346138016
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission relates to Millstreet Town and area. Firstly, the submission states that the town is in desperate need of a fully operational creche and states that the lack of such service is restrictive and prohibitive to working parents. The submission requests that provision be made for this in the CDP as it would add to the attraction of young families coming to live in the area.

	<p>The submission also requests that the access to the primary schools needs to be considered further as the schools do not have a carpark the parents use the council carpark and town park carpark which requires use of the footpath which it is stated while pushing a buggy is inadequate and very dangerous and that there is a risk of a person being injured by a car.</p> <p>In addition, the submission states that the traffic calming efforts at the schools at school times are inadequate noting in particular that the Clara Rd junction is very busy and with parents and kids waiting at school times there is a serious accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>The submission notes that the footpath at Corkery's junction is not buggy or wheelchair accessible. It is also suggested that in an effort to improve the tourism of the town that the access to the train station needs urgent attention as there is no footpath outside the station grounds and it could be dangerous to any tourists not familiar with the location and the submission requests that the lighting along this stretch would also benefit from improvements.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the CDP provide for additional fully operational creches in Millstreet?</li> <li>2. Can the CDP provide for a car park and better accessibility to the schools?</li> <li>3. Can the CDP improve footpaths generally in the town and also around the train station?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CDP has policies regarding the provision of Childcare in Chapter 6 Social and Community (6.3) and it is also an objective of the CDP to Support and facilitate the sustainable provision of childcare facilities in appropriate locations and seek their provision concurrent with development, having regard to population targets for the area and in accordance with the Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Local Authorities 2001 and regard to the Universal Design Guidelines for Early Learning and Care Centres 2019 (SC 6-4: Childcare Facilities).</li> <li>2. Yes, while General Objective MS-GO-10 states that All development should contribute to improved, safe pedestrian and cyclist connectivity and should include proposals for the provision of improved pedestrian / cycle access routes, provision of new footpaths or improvement of existing footpaths and provision of facilities or cyclists, as appropriate, and this includes schools. This issue will also be referred to the Municipal District office.</li> <li>3. See Above.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Amendment Required</li> <li>2. No Amendment Required</li> <li>3. No Amendment Required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Una and Peter Cronin</b>
<b>DCDP345922071</b>	DCDP345922071
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission concerns lands at Chapel Hill, Macroom which have been included within the development boundary of the Draft Plan and are zoned for "Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and other uses". The submission supports the zoning and requests that it is included as part of the final adopted Cork County Development Plan. Submission indicates</p>

	that the lands are within easy walking distance of Macroom Town Centre, c.400 metres, close to services and amenities, are serviceable and available for development, and will support sequential, compact growth.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. This submission supports the designation of these lands in the Draft Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. Noted
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Vicky &amp; John Purcell</b>
<b>DCDP346497305</b>	DCDP346497305
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that the subject lands be removed from the KO-GC-02 and instead identified as forming part of the built-up area and remaining as 'existing residential' as currently zoned in the 2017 LAP. The submission states that the CFRAMs report confirms that part of the lands may flood but that it does not include or go anyway near the area coloured green on the draft map. The submission also confirms no objection to the development of a walkway along the river corridor and that this could be delivered as part of any future development of the said lands.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Can the boundary of KO-GC-02 be amended to reflect the new flood boundary as set out in the SFRA?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. While the Planning Authority notes that the Flood Zone area has reduced following the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, it is considered that this area is of high ecological value including a river corridor and mature trees and the boundary should not be changed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>William &amp; Larry Buckley</b>
<b>DCDP346137067</b>	DCDP346137067
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission requests that Cork County Council designate Farran as a village within the settlement hierarchy of the current draft County Development Plan and to provide a defined boundary for the village which would incorporate already constructed dwellings and additional lands outlined in the submission. It argues that this would accommodate further likely growth demand and help to retain and improve local services and facilities. The submission compares Farran with other villages in the Macroom MD noting that it has a significant population identified in the 2016 Census, a school, community centre and public house, a local store and public transport (233 bus route to Cork City). The submission also points to the strategic position of Farran along the primary N22 route.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Should Farran be included in the network of settlements within the Macroom MD and given a future unit development allocation?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	1. It is considered that while Farran has a church and a school and a CSO population of 345, it is just a collection of one off houses in an

	area with very difficult steep topography and very narrow and poorly aligned roads, accessed from T junctions with the N22. It has no public water or WWTP and is not an area where I think we should be advocating growth, other than natural growth arising in the area which can be accommodated via the rural housing policy.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No Amendment Required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>William and Larry Buckley</b>
<b>DCDP346273445</b>	DCDP346273445
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Duplicate Submission. Please refer to the submission Ref DCDP346137067
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Duplicate Submission. Please refer to the submission Ref DCDP346137067
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Duplicate Submission. Please refer to the submission Ref DCDP346137067
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Duplicate Submission. Please refer to the submission Ref DCDP346137067







Comhairle Contae Chorcaí  
Cork County Council