



Cork County Development Plan Review

Section 12(4) Chief Executive's Report

Volume II: Chief Executive's Responses and Recommendations • June 2014



Contents

Section 2(a)(i)	Chief Executive's Response to the Submissions from the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government and South West Regional Authority	4
Section 2(a)(ii)	All other Submissions (by interested party A-Z)	15
Section 2(b)	Chief Executive's Response to the Planning SPC Submission	283
Section 2(c)	Chief Executive's Response to the Submissions made to Appendix G (Residential Density Proposed Changes to Electoral Area LAP Zoning Objectives)	312

Section 2(a)(i): Submissions from the Department of Environment and South West Regional Authority

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government dCDP14/1842</p>	<p>1) Draft Plan sets out a strong and effective development strategy. 2) Recognise requirement for effective engagement by relevant infrastructure providers. 3) Needs to provide clearer guidance of the overall scale of development proposed in future LAPs. 4) Clarify the current position with regard to zoning of lands in smaller settlements. 5) Show the quantum of zoned land required to meet the population targets set out for each settlement. 6) Supports the adoption of a more flexible approach to the application of housing density. 7) Supports the approach taken to rural housing policies which is regarded as exemplar. 8) Supports the proposal to establish a fund for town centre renewable projects including the provision of better car parking. 9) Recognises the importance of energy and in particular renewable energy as a key economic driver. 10) Plan sets out a clear policy framework for the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide a clearer overall framework for deciding on the scale, phasing and location of new development lands in Local Area Plan (LAPs) and show clearly how it is intended to deal with any shortfall/ excess in the amount of zoned land?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clearly show that the supply of land identified is sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required?</p> <p>5. Supports approach taken to Rural Housing which is regarded as exemplar.</p>	<p>1 to 4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>5. Noted</p>	<p>1 to 4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>5.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>future development of the wind energy sector. 11) Plan needs to clearly set out criteria used to identify the employment hierarchy. 12) Plan displays a sensible approach to the setting of standards for car parking provision. 13) It is appropriate that green infrastructure is both recognised and protected. 14) Plan needs additional measures to protect biodiversity particularly in relation to the fresh water pearl mussel populations in the Blackwater River. 15) Expresses concerns about Council approach to zoning and the provision of waste facilities.</p>	<p>6. Appropriate that green infrastructure is recognised and protected.</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to reword objective ZU 3-7 to better reflect national waste management policy?</p> <p>8. Can the Plan confirm whether the retail figures, and related policies and objectives contained in the Draft Plan are consistent with the population targets set out in its proposed Core Strategy?</p>	<p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p> <p>8. The distribution of convenience and comparison floorspace throughout the Metropolitan Area is based on existing market share and the population targets as set out in the South West Regional Planning Guidelines.</p>	<p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. Amendment Required</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>South West Regional Authority dCDP14/1775</p>	<p>Confirms that the Draft Plan is as far as practical consistent with the Regional Planning Guidelines and makes a number of recommendations to further improve the plans alignment with the Guidelines.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 1 – It is recommended that policies and objectives within the Core Strategy and Draft Plan (in particular Chapters 14 and 15) are amended to include an overall implementation framework for deciding on the scale, phasing and location of new development lands in Local Area Plan (LAPs). In this regard it is recommended that the Local Authority clearly indicates the amount of residential lands required (in hectares) to meet the identified need of each settlement identified in the Core Strategy of the Draft Plan. The Local Authority is referred to the <i>DECLG ‘Guidance Note on Core Strategies’</i> which contains an illustrative example of a Core Strategy table where proposed zoning and shortfall/excess are presented.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 2 – Objective ZU 2-3 of the Draft Plan states that all</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to provide a clearer overall framework for deciding on the scale, phasing and location of new development lands in Local Area Plan (LAPs) and show clearly how it is intended to deal with any shortfall/ excess in the amount of zoned land? 2. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify sufficient lands to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period? 4. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required? 5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to 	<p>It is noted that the SWRA confirm that the Draft Plan is as far as practical consistent with the South West Regional Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>1 to 5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>	<p>1 to 5 See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>lands within a development boundary that is not subject to a specific zoning objective, are deemed to be zoned residential or mixed uses for the purposes of Part V of the Planning and Development Acts. It is recommended that the Local Authority should clarify whether this will require information of net residential lands zoned in villages to be provided in the Core Strategy Tables.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 3 – For lands which are identified as being surplus for the plan period, it is recommended that the Local Authority provide details of their intentions to deal with these surplus lands during the LAP process. It is also recommended that the Local Authority should provide details of how zoning proposals will accord with national policy that development of land shall take place on a phased basis. According to the DECLG ‘Guidance Note on Core Strategies’, the Core Strategy must demonstrate how the level of any excess of land or housing will be addressed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 4 – It is recommended that the Draft Plan</p>	<p>reflect the impact of population growth targets on sensitive water catchments such as the Blackwater and Cork Harbour?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider housing vacancy levels?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure compliance with the SEA Directive & River Basin Management Plans?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider similar social and community objectives to those contained in the RPG?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide further clarification with regard to objective ZU 2-3 "Housing Strategy and</p>	<p>6. The Joint Housing Strategy which informs the Draft Plan contained analysis on the vacancy levels in the county from the data supplied by the Department of Environment for the baseline year (2012). It is intended to include additional text to explain the Core Strategy tables.</p> <p>7. It is considered that the policies in Chapter 13 and Objective GI 10-1 are sufficient to ensure compliance with the relevant River Basin Management Plans.</p> <p>8. The intent of the social and community objectives contained in the SWRPG are addressed in particular in Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5 and 12 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>9. It is intended to delete ZU 2-3 and amend objective HOU 5-1.</p>	<p>6. Amendment Required</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required</p> <p>9. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>should describe how it considered vacancy levels, unfinished housing estates and extant planning permissions in the estimation of housing land and unit requirement and supply over the Development Plan period. It is considered that these are key elements that should be examined.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 5 – Having regard to the extensive settlement network, clarification is required on the overall proposed settlement strategy and any proposed priority areas for growth. As per the RPGs, the overall priorities should be the Cork Gateway and Mallow Hub. Other priorities should seek to optimise development opportunities in the most sustainable locations, particularly those with infrastructural capacity to accommodate targeted growth. It is recommended that a clear strategy should be provided for securing the population targets of the</p>	<p>Development Boundaries"?</p> <p>10. Can the Plan confirm whether the retail figures, and related policies and objectives contained in the Draft Plan are consistent with the population targets set out in its proposed Core Strategy?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage the increased use of alternative fuels and technologies and carpooling/car sharing?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide for the monitoring of key indicators in order to assess how progress towards achieving the targets in the plan?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that City and County economic strategies are aligned where practical?</p>	<p>10. The distribution of convenience and comparison floorspace throughout the Metropolitan Area is based on existing market share and the population targets as set out within the Regional Planning Guidelines for the South West Region.</p> <p>11. The Draft Plan encourages all forms of sustainable transport.</p> <p>12. It is intended to set out a list of key targets and indicators in Chapter 15 to enable appropriate monitoring of the plans progress.</p> <p>13. It is considered that when the Regional Spatial and Economic Plan is published by the Regional Assembly it may be necessary to amend this plan. In addition, the Local Economic and Community Plans (LECP) currently being prepared will have a statutory</p>	<p>10. No Amendment Required</p> <p>11. No Amendment Required</p> <p>12. Amendment Required</p> <p>13. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>towns. The targeted growth, phasing and development needs of all settlements should be guided by existing and planned infrastructure capacity, particularly in terms of water services.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 6 – It is recommended that the Draft Plan should clarify as to how the figures for the villages and rural areas were calculated and formulated as the relationship between the targeted population increase and the units required and supplied is unclear. The method used to arrive at these figures should also be set out in the plan.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 7 - The Draft Plan should provide proposals of monitoring required to allow implementation of the strategy to be analysed so corrective action can be taken as required. It is recommended that Chapter 15 is revised to include a list of the key issues that need to be monitored in order to ensure the</p>	<p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that there are sufficient employment lands available to meet future needs in particular to accommodate large stand alone developments and office based industry?</p> <p>15. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the employment hierarchy and objectives align with its settlement strategy?</p> <p>16. Should the Draft Plan be amended to indicate the current modal share across the county?</p>	<p>obligation regarding the promotion of economic and enterprise across economic sectors, including both FDI and Indigenous Industry.</p> <p>14. It is considered that there is sufficient land zoned for employment uses in the respective Local Area Plans. When the Regional Assembly Spatial and Economic Strategy is prepared the Council can review the suitability of its employment land supply.</p> <p>15. It is intended to revise Table 6.1 to show a stronger link between the employment hierarchy and the settlement strategy.</p> <p>16. It is intended to include additional information in relation to current modal share in Chapter 10.</p>	<p>14. No Amendment Required</p> <p>15. Amendment Required.</p> <p>16. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>strategy of the plan is delivered. Monitoring should, for example, track the amount of development taking place in each settlement and the amount of rural one offs being granted so trends in meeting targets and objectives of the Draft Plan can be monitored.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 8 – It is recommended that, as far as is practicable, the economic and employment strategies for the Draft Developments Plans of both Cork City and Cork County complement and are consistent with each other.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 9 - It is recommended that the Draft Plan confirms whether sufficient lands are zoned for industrial/commercial and mixed use purposes to accommodate the level of population growth outlined in its Core Strategy.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 10 - It is recommended that the Local Authority confirms that sufficient strategic land reserves are provided for both existing and new large scale stand alone industries as well as land reserves for the growing international traded services sector (office based</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>industry). Specifically, the Local Authority should confirm if strategic land reserves have been identified in the Cork Gateway and Mallow Hub as per Objective RES-06 of the RPGs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 11 - It is recommended that the Local Authority should clearly demonstrate how the Draft Plan employment hierarchy and objectives align with its settlement strategy. In this regard it is recommended that the Local Authority should set out the criteria used to identify the employment hierarchy in Table 6.1 and in particular the criteria used to identify the categories 'Other towns and key villages' and 'Rural areas'.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 12 - It is recommended that the Local Authority should present the existing non car work related modal share within the Cork Gateway, Mallow Hub, other main towns and rural areas. This would provide a baseline from which progress towards the targets identified under Objective TM 1-1 (g) of the Draft Plan could be monitored.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 13 - It appears</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>that there is no reference in Chapter 10 to actions to encourage the increased use of alternatives fuels and technologies and improving the fuel efficiency of motorised transport as per the third of the four overarching actions detailed under Section 5.2.5 of the RPGs. It is therefore recommended that the Local Authority should provide objectives aimed at improving the fuel efficiency of motorised transport through improved fleet structure, increased use of biofuels, energy efficient driving, alternative technologies and electric car initiatives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 14 - It is recommended that the policies and objectives regarding other forms of sustainable transportation such as carpooling/car sharing could be considered by the Local Authority.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 15 - It is recommended that the Draft Plan settlement strategy should be framed by the availability and capacity of water and wastewater services, transport, energy and other infrastructural considerations and it is considered that the availability of such</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>services should be aligned with Draft Development Plan Core Strategy.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 16 - It is recommended that the Local Authority considers the potential for cross-boundary consultation in order to assess any cumulative impacts and to ensure compliance with the SEA Directive. Consideration should be given to environmental and water quality issues emerging from all relevant River Basin Management Plans within, and adjoining the County. The Draft Plan should ensure that all new development is directed towards those areas which have the environmental capacity to absorb it.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 17 - It is recommended that the Draft Plan should including, where appropriate, similar social and community strategy themes and issues contained in the RPGs, in particular objectives REAS-07 (Social and Community Infrastructure) and REAS-10 (Social Inclusion and Regeneration).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 18 - In accordance with Objective REAS-10 of the RPGs, it is recommended that the Draft Plan should identify or should</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>provide a context for the Local Area Plans to identify, where appropriate, those urban and rural areas where social deprivation occurs and where there are community infrastructural deficits and develop an appropriate policy framework to deal with the issues arising.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 19 - It is recommended that the Draft Plan confirms whether the retail figures, and related policies and objectives contained in the Draft Plan are consistent with the population targets set out in its proposed Core Strategy.</p>			

Section 2(a)(ii): All Other Submissions (by interested party A-Z)

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
Acadamh Fódhla dCDP14/1926	This submission notes that there has been a considerable erosion of the indigenous culture in recent years and makes a series of recommendations including a recognition of the fragility of the current state of the Cork Gaeltacht, a decision to place the indigenous culture as the key priority in all planning decisions in the Gaeltacht area, the development of a partnership with other bodies including Udarás na Gaeltachta, UCC, Cork Kerry Tourism etc. It also advocates the development of a positive strategy to grow this resource for the benefit of Cork City and County.	1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the fragility of the Cork Gaeltacht and encourage the development of a positive strategy to grow this important cultural resource?	1. Section 12.5 (12.5.9 & 12.5.10) Chapter 12 recognises the importance of our cultural heritage in particular the Gaeltacht and linguistic heritage and sets out policies and objectives to support these areas.	1. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Agar, Jeff and Croonenberg, Carlien dCDP14/1730</p>	<p>This submission is supportive of initiatives to reduce carbon emissions. It states that an Environmental Impact Statement for a wind farm has been carried out in the area and continues by setting out social and health concerns in relation to wind farms as follows:</p> <p>1. The current guidelines whilst acknowledging the effect of shadow flicker and noise levels is not addressing the issue of setback, over dominance, scale and effect on property values in close proximity. The suggested 500 meters is a copy of the 2006 guidelines based on the effects of much smaller turbines.</p> <p>2. Undemocratic to rely on an EIS drawn up by consultancy firms on the pay roll of an energy company and suggests that noise tests at noise sensitive locations and the EIS could be done for Cork County Council on behalf of community</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to take consideration of social and health concerns in relation to wind farms including the issue of setback distances(the 2006 guidelines based on the effects of much smaller turbines), noise concerns, over dominance, scale and property devaluation?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to try and keep turbines away from homes and influence developers to compensate people living 1500 metres from a large turbine as companies helping with a community project alone considered inadequate compensation?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to require wind farm developers to consult with local communities?</p>	<p>1. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>2. The issue of compensation is a matter for national legislative change and cannot be addressed in this plan.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the Planning Acts in relation to development management and plan making make sufficient provision for public consultation.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>and at the expense of the developers to avoid conflict of interest in protecting natural and historical heritage.</p> <p>3. Property devaluation is an individual concern to people who hope to scale down on retirement.</p> <p>4. Suggests that the council try and keep turbines away from homes and try influence developers to compensate people living 1500 metres from a large turbine as companies helping with a community project alone considered inadequate compensate for the full economic effect on the community.</p> <p>A link has been attached of a recent study by the Spatial and Economic Research Centre; Windfarms and house prices.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Aghabullogue Coachford Rylane (ACR) Heritage dCDP14/1819</p>	<p>Submission from Aghabullogue Coachford Rylane (ACR) Community Council proposes several routeways for inclusion in the plan as Scenic Routes. This submission should be read in conjunction with dCDP14/1823.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan identify additional scenic routes?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified 118 specific Scenic Routes consisting of important and valued views and prospects within the County and it is not intended to identify any further scenic routes at this time.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Aghabullogue Coachford Rylane (ACR) Heritage dCDP14/1823</p>	<p>This submission should be read in conjunction with CDP14/1819 and includes 5 additional proposed scenic routes for consideration.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan identify additional scenic routes?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified 118 specific Scenic Routes consisting of important and valued views and prospects within the County and it is not intended to identify any further scenic routes at this time.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Aherne, Matt dCDP14/1771</p>	<p>This submission requests that the proposed road labelled U-01 on the Passage West map in the Carrigaline EA LAP be removed as it is effectively sterilising a significant part of his land holding and making any development proposal very difficult.</p>	<p>1. Can the development plan remove U-01 on the Passage West zoning map in the Carrigaline Electoral Area Local Area Plan, 2011?</p>	<p>1. This objective is part of the Carrigaline Electoral Area Local Area Plan, 2011 which is not currently under review. It is not possible to consider deleting this objective as part of the county development plan review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Aldi Stores (Ireland) Ltd dCDP14/1822</p>	<p>This submission notes in section 7.8 of the draft Cork County Development Plan 2015-2021 that outside of Metropolitan Cork, the more dispersed pattern of retail centres allows somewhat greater freedom for future retail floorspace of an appropriate scale and location to be more market led. It is also noted in the submission that the key will be a Retail Impact Assessment and the proposed location which is critical to determining the acceptability of the proposal, as elicited by policies TCR 8-1 and TCR 8-2 of the draft Cork County Development Plan 2015-2021. However, it also notes that the estimated gross floorspace assessment in the Part A: Non-Metropolitan Retail Background Paper is derived from the polygon shape of individual buildings surveyed and the Council should clarify that, having regard to policies TCR 8-1 and TCR 8-2 of the draft Cork</p>	<p>Can it be confirmed that information contained in the Part A: Non-Metropolitan Retail Background Paper, is for general information purposes only and that it is up to prospective developers to make their case in their own Retail Impact Assessments?</p>	<p>The Town Centre Study reports were commissioned as part of background work in the preparation of the Draft Plan. They were intended to give an overall impression of town centres including the wider retail landscape of the county. Individual retail proposals which should be accompanied by a retail impact assessment will be considered on their merits.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>County Development Plan 2015-2021 and the importance placed on the Retail Impact Assessment, that the information contained in the Part A: Non-Metropolitan Retail Background Paper, is for general information purposes only and that it is up to prospective developers to make their case in their own Retail Impact Assessments.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>An Taisce, the National Trust for Ireland dCDP14/1853</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CDP needs evidence based, plan-led strategy for future spatial development to address energy scarcity and climate change. 2. Ensure vagueness and 'let-out' clauses are removed. 3. Explain planning terms in glossary. 4. Restrictions on settlement in Greenbelt should be tightened. 5. What equates to sustainable growth in population in rural areas? 6. What equates to well populated countryside, the CDP should define pop target envisaged for countryside. 7. Promote nucleation, serviced sites and urban-generated settlement. 8. Recommendations of EPA 2010 report should be included. 9. Refer to Forfas Energy Statement. 10. Moratorium on net increase in one-off housing units. 11. Support provision of energy efficiency and conservation measures. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a glossary of planning terms? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide greater guidance on the level of population growth in rural areas? 3. Should the Metropolitan Greenbelt Policy be amended to prevent further incremental erosion? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a moratorium on net increase in housing units in rural areas? 5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include proactive measures that protect rural areas from a proliferation of car-dependent dispersed urban-generated settlement? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is intended that the final published Plan will include a glossary for information purposes only to assist the public and will not form part of the legal document. 2. Guidance on the amount of rural housing expected in each of the Strategic Planning Areas is set out in Appendix A and progress will be regularly monitored. 3. The greenbelt policy in the Draft Plan which broadly reflects the policy of the 2009 CDP and takes account of Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines is considered appropriate. 4. Such a proposal would conflict with the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines. 5. The Draft Plan provides a rural housing policy for all rural areas of the County in line with the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required 3. No Amendment Required 4. No Amendment Required 5. No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>12. RCI 5-4 Council has failed to produce policy to prevent Greenbelt erosion.</p> <p>13. Specific objective required in relation to Cork Science Park to ensure compliance with Smarter Travel policy.</p> <p>14. Refer to key reports on Climate Change and Oil Dependency.</p> <p>15. Omit objective which provide for investment in oil dependent infrastructure.</p> <p>16. Prepare strategy which would see electrical generation needs of the locality primarily met by renewable sources by 2020.</p> <p>17. Obligation to respond to challenges of climate change through dev which reduces energy use.</p> <p>18. Car Parking Requirements re: Table 1a - dev type figures unjustified given higher modal splits, in Cork City Environs, whereas the rest of the County is car dependant.CDP to justify these figures.</p> <p>19. Prioritise transition to low-</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	carbon society.			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Archer, Brian dCDP14/1920</p>	<p>1. Queries whether his submission in its entirety will be made available to members. 2. Commends the Council on the plans relative brevity, the new density policy and regarding the manner and location of the development of Cork Harbour as a major port. 3. Describes Para 3.4.12 which states that ‘the County Council’s practice has been to prepare master plans or other site specific plans to address detailed site planning and density issues’ as complete nonsense and expresses great concern regarding the lack of progress on same and suggests that the best approach would be to draw a line around the designated development areas, state the range of projects in these areas and allow other competent professionals to prepare the plans. 4. Makes reference to TM3-2 which is to ‘seek funding’ and not ‘to finance’ projects critical to the delivery of planned</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork? 3. Supports the proposed housing density policy. 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give an earlier requirement for key infrastructure in Carrigtwohill? 5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Para 6.3.6 and Objective EE 4-1? 6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify Para 9.1.6 and should part of objective ED1-3 be deleted?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”. 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”. 3. Noted. 4. The Infrastructure Tables will be revised to reflect Irish Waters recently publish Proposed Investment Plan which includes the upgrading of the Carrigtwohill WWTP. 5. It is considered that the wording of Para 6.3.6 and Objective EE 4-1 as proposed is appropriate to protect such strategic employment areas for future development. 6. The Draft Plan objective sets out a balanced approach to the future development of Whitegate.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 3. Noted 4. Amendment Required 5.No Amendment Required 6. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>development.</p> <p>5. Expresses concern that Para 6.3.6 and EE 4-1 could be interpreted as being restrictive and might militate against future strategic employment developments.</p> <p>6. Seeks a revision to Para 9.1.6 ‘Whitegate must be protected for energy use from inappropriate uses’, and also requests that ‘in a manner that is compatible with the residential and amenity’ is deleted from ED1-3.</p> <p>7. Requests that the Major Housing Project north of Carrigtwohill should at the very least straddle ‘short – medium/long term timing sections of Table 15.1</p>	<p>7. Should the draft plan be amended to clarify Objective ED 1-1 and omit ‘through sustainable development’ from this policy objective?</p>	<p>7. These words should be retained in order to provide for balanced development.</p>	<p>7. No Amendment Required</p>
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Active Retirement Group dCDP14/1747</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. Requests that the following text 'Sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.	be approved to sustain a vibrant community?		
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Community Planning Committee dCDP14/1760</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield/Rathbarry parish.</p> <p>2. It is vital that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area are prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area which has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which has lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs.</p> <p>3. Local community organisations /clubs have concerns about their sustainability if young people have to leave the parish.</p> <p>4. Requests that the following</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Foroige Youth Club dCDP14/1745</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield/Rathbarry parish. 2. Acknowledges that this rural area has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which have lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs. 3. Local community organisations have concerns about their sustainability.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>4. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Gardening Club dCDP14/1808</p>	<p>1. New plan is too restrictive for young people in the community, who want to live and work in their native community. 2. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Hall Committee dCDP14/1749</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield/Rathbarry parish. 2. Acknowledges that this rural area has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft CDP categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft CDP be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>have lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs.</p> <p>3. Local community organisations have concerns about their sustainability.</p> <p>4. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>community?</p>		
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Pioneer Association dCDP14/1744</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield/Rathbarry parish.</p> <p>2. Acknowledges that this rural area has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which have lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>3. Local community organisations have concerns about their sustainability.</p> <p>4. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Playground dCDP14/1812</p>	<p>1. Present plan is too restrictive for young families who want the chance to make a home in the community of Ardfield / Rathbarry.</p> <p>2. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>
<p>Ardfield / Rathbarry Rowing Club dCDP14/1801</p>	<p>1. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Ardfield FC dCDP14/1746</p>	<p>1. Outlines how Ardfield FC has developed since it was established and requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>
<p>Ardfield National School dCDP14/1807</p>	<p>1. Present plan is too restrictive for young people from the community, who want to live, work and have their children educated in their native community. 2. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Ardfield Rathbarry Community Alert dCDP14/1754</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield/Rathbarry parish. 2. Young families should be given the opportunity to live in the parish. States that both schools in the parish have recently been extended and it is very important that there should be sufficient children to justify this. 3. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Ballincollig Business Association dCDP14/1917</p>	<p>This submission raises a number of issues regarding the development of Ballincollig and requests a number of amendments to the draft County Development Plan in order to facilitate and accelerate the realisation of the town's strategic objectives and expedite the delivery of the required infrastructure and make funding and support from other statutory bodies easier.</p> <p>1. Makes particular reference to Social / Green Infrastructure and the extension of lee fields to Ballincollig Regional Park, 2. The vacancy issue in the town centre and the potential for additional comparison retail 3. Requests that the Water Upgrade and Local Roads / Public Transport issues need to be short rather than medium / long term issues and 4. Requests that an Integrated Transport and Mobility Study should be prepared for Ballincollig to promote a modal shift to more sustainable modes</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a specific objective for the extension of Lee fields to Ballincollig Regional Park?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote a specific Land Use and Transportation Study for Ballincollig?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give an earlier requirement for the delivery of key infrastructure in Ballincollig?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to strengthen paragraph 7.7.6 regarding existing vacancy levels in Ballincollig?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify that Metropolitan Towns and District Centres are on the same level of the hierarchy?</p>	<p>1. It is intended to include a specific objective in CS 4-1 relating to the extension of Lee fields to Ballincollig Regional Park.</p> <p>2. This is a matter for the next LAP review. The study should form an important background document to inform the review.</p> <p>3. It is intended to review the Infrastructure Tables 15.1 and 15.2 in Chapter 15 and further consideration will be given to the infrastructure delivery timeline for Ballincollig.</p> <p>4. The existing wording in the plan and Joint Retail Strategy is adequate to ensure vacancy is dealt with in a proactive and practical manner.</p> <p>5. Metropolitan Towns and District Centres are at the same level in the hierarchy and it is intended to revise Table 7.1 to reflect this.</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required</p> <p>5. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	of transport and plan for the future transport needs of the town.	6. Should the Draft Plan description for Metropolitan Towns be amended to delete reference to the word 'modest' regarding comparison retailing?	6. The word "modest" is intended to be descriptive only, however it is proposed to replace it with the word "varied"	6. Amendment Required
Ballyvolane Developments Ltd dCDP14/1861	This submission makes comment on the "Draft Metropolitan Cork Joint Retail Strategy (December 2013)" and the "Non-Metropolitan Retail Background Paper". 1. It welcomes the Councils' objective in Section 7.4 of the Retail Strategy regarding the promotion of further convenience development in the northern suburbs and Policy Objective 11. 2. It is argued that the development of Ballyvolane as	1) Is there potential conflict with T-01 of the Blarney LAP and Section 4 of Draft Strategy regarding Ballyvolane?	1) The approach to Ballyvolane as set out within the Retail Strategy and Study is in accordance with the approach set out within the 2011 Blarney EA LAP. Paragraph 2.3.5 of this plan outlines that: "given the population growth targeted for Ballyvolane, additional retail facilities will need to be provided at a new district centre serving the area". It is within this context that the requirement for additional district centre facilities is identified within the LAP. Furthermore, given the proximity of the lands to the administrative boundary of Cork City Council it is considered important that	1. No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>a District Centre being contingent on future population growth and subject to a coordinated approach between the Councils' is at variance with the objectives contained within the Blarney EA LAP 2010 where the site is zoned T-01 Town Centre.</p> <p>3. It is also requested that Policy Objective 11 paragraph 3, pg 10 of the Draft Retail Strategy should be amended to reflect the T-01 zoning of the lands in Ballyvolane.</p> <p>4. It also suggests that the approach in relation to vacancy levels is not proportional and that in its current form this policy encourages the take-up of vacant floorspace within the metropolitan towns rather than the provision of new floor space within the environs of Cork City Centre where there is appropriate population and expected growth.</p> <p>5. It is argued that the approach to pipeline floor space, is subjective, creates</p>	<p>2) Should the Draft Plan promote the development of District Centres across the North side in an equal manner?</p>	<p>co-ordinated approach to the development of district centre facilities at this location is advocated.</p> <p>2) The nature and scale of retail proposed within individual centres will be considered on its merits and in relation to overall impact on the primacy of the City Centre as set out in objective TCR4-4.</p>	<p>2) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>uncertainty and acts as a barrier to the delivery of new floor space in the Metropolitan Area and that the Retail Strategy should promote objectives which identify the potential for an alternative location for a District Centre in the North Western Suburbs.</p>			
<p>Barnett, Bria dCDP14/1890</p>	<p>1. Areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. 2. Requests the Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Barnett, Bria dCDP14/1891</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Mountains and Gougane Barra in the 'Normally Discouraged' wind deployment area?		
Barnett, Russell dCDP14/1894	1. County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. 2. Requests the Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to tourism development?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.	No Amendment Required.
Barnett, Russell dCDP14/1896	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft CDP be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra in the 'Normally Discouraged' wind deployment area?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
Barry, Tom TD dCDP14/1802	<p>1. States the CDP should take a strategic view of the road infrastructure in Mallow, to include the importance of the proposed Ring Road.</p> <p>2. Would like to see a study of possible road links to alleviate traffic within the town and provide access to facilities</p>	Should the Draft Plan be amended to take a strategic view of road infrastructure in Mallow to include the importance of the proposed Ring Road?	Objective TM3-1 (National Road Network) of Chapter 10 states that the Council will seek the support of the NRA in the implementation of the following key national and regional projects which include Mallow i.e. the M20 and N72 (Mallow Northern Relief Road).	No Amendment Required
Bland, Cathy dCDP14/1871	<p>1. Areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes.</p> <p>2. Requests the Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	No Amendment Required.
Bland, Cathy dCDP14/1873	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for	Should the Draft CDP be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra in	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	the 'Normally Discouraged' wind deployment area?	Wind Energy"	
Bland, Dave dCDP14/1878	See dCDP14/1873	See dCDP14/1873	See dCDP14/1873	See dCDP14/1873
Bland, David dCDP14/1872	See dCDP14/1871	See dCDP14/1871	See dCDP14/1871	See dCDP14/1871
Blarney Community Council Ltd. dCDP14/1856	Requests that the area of the village of Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate as outlined on accompanying maps be designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). The submission notes that some of the buildings within the boundary are already on the Register of Protected Structures and as the curtilage of these buildings is included it is logical to include all within an ACA, thus acknowledging that the setting is more extensive and the historical significance is of equal importance. The submission requests that the boundary of the proposed ACA should extend to include the Catholic Church and the	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the village of Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate to be designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA)?	It is intended to include part of the village of Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate in an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).	Amendment required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Church of Ireland all as indicated on the attached map.			
Blarney Community Council Limited dCDP14/1810	Submission requests the R-03 site in Blarney be re-zoned to A3 or Green Belt zoning.	1. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to include land presently zoned for residential development?	1. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the next LAP review.	No Amendment Required
Bord Gais Energy dCDP14/1795	1. Serious concerns with regard to the potentially detrimental impact the draft plan may have on the viability of a significant number of projects at pre-planning stage. Call on Cork County Council to strongly consider and implement the following: Retain the designation of Open to Consideration and where possible Strategic Search Areas (in line with 2009 Plan) for areas within the North-West and North of the County to allow the Council and An Bord Pleanala, to adjudicate upon individual wind energy development planning applications on a case-by-case	Should the Draft Plan be amended so as to retain the designation of Open to Consideration for areas within the North-West and North of the County?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"	No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>basis in line with National and European Legislation and Best Practice Guidance, in conjunction with the National Parks and Wildlife Service and other stakeholders.</p> <p>2. BGE fully supports IWEA's submitted response to this consultation.</p> <p>3. BGE and other key stakeholders in the industry, have invested significant resources into the progression of its development pipeline within the North and North-West of the County, to build on the success of permitted and constructed developments, while utilising the available grid capacity and grid infrastructural improvements (both completed and planned) to their best potential. This significant investment is now in serious jeopardy.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Brideview Developments dCDP14/1806</p>	<p>Despite reasonable measures to secure and protect Lakeview House RPS 00519 by Brideview Developments (who have a proven track record in the care and preservation of historic buildings) malicious damage and theft has resulted in a scenario where the protection of Lakeview House is no longer warranted. It is therefore submitted that it is appropriate to remove the house from the Record of Protected Structures under the provisions of s.54 (1)(a)(ii) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete Lakeview House from the Record of Protected Structures (RPS)?</p>	<p>Early 19th century regency structure. Whilst recognising that there has been damage to the building and removal of features, the structure has not entirely lost its special interest value with internal and external walls substantially intact. It is considered that the house has special interest value and is a local landmark which forms part of the history and development of Midleton. This building should be retained on the RPS.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Bright Beginnings Montessori Pre-school dCDP14/1753</p>	<p>1. Planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish.</p> <p>2. Expresses concern at the sustainability of local community business / services (including the subject pre-school facility) without young families and children in the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	community.			
<p>Bright, Phoebe dCDP14/1867</p>	<p>Submission acknowledges that the draft development plan has addressed most of the submitters concerns, is a well designed and written document with interesting supporting information. Minor issue reading the sideways online maps.</p> <p>The following points have been made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The term sustainability is used very frequently. 2. Suggests the use of an icon that indicates the long term impact of different areas of the plan in terms of generations as outlined. 3. Acknowledges the section on future development in flood risk zones and queries how intend to deal with existing flood problems? A letter published in the Southern Star is enclosed suggesting one 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide information on how it is intended to deal with existing areas prone to flooding? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider public consultation as poor consultation by some of the wind farm developers is a concern? 3. Should the Draft CDP be amended to include suggested wording in relation to the District Heating section? 4. Should the Draft CDP be amended to consider the requirement for better speeds and broadband coverage over the County? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Draft Plan Section 11.6 and the 2011 Electoral Area Local Area Plans set out the Council’s approach to flood risk management in line with the Ministerial Guidelines – ‘The Planning System and Flood Risk Management’ and it is considered that this provides adequate guidance. 2. It is considered that the Planning Acts in relation to development management and plan making make sufficient provision for public consultation. 3. It is considered that the current wording in Section 9.4.29 is sufficient. 4. Adequate support has been provided in the Draft Plan, see policies 9.7.1 to 9.7.7 and objective ED 7-1 and ED 7-2. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required. 4. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>solution to Skibbereen's problems i.e. to move the town. Difficult decisions may have to be made about the viability of some settlements in the coming decades. Flooding issues in towns and lack of insurance leads to an inability to sell buildings or attract businesses leading to the slow decline of a town.</p> <p>4. Hard for local people to accept more wind development which is considered a blot on landscape forever.</p> <p>5. Poor consultation by some of the wind farm developers and room for support from the Planning department in this area.</p> <p>6. The District Heating section could be strengthened to read suggested wording.</p> <p>7. Better speeds and Broadband coverage required over the county and benefits outlined.</p> <p>8. Passive House Design in New buildings and extensions should show that they have maximised potential solar gain in their design and orientation.</p>	<p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to require passive House Design in New buildings and extensions to show that they have maximised potential solar gain in their design and orientation?</p>	<p>5. It is considered that the policies set out in Section 9.5 and Objective ED 5-1 of the Draft Plan provide sufficient guidance.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Brown, Justin dCDP14/1787</p>	<p>Requests the implementation of a policy driven scenario that introduces support mechanisms and political will to consider PV as a major power source within the new development plan for Cork. It states that achieving this will require removing unnecessary administrative barriers and streamlining grid connection and planning procedure.</p> <p>The benefits include the following, a balanced energy mix, alternative to wind, job creation, 1MW per hectare generating 950,000kWh per year, reduction in carbon emissions in line with EU directives and localised energy security which alleviates the need for additional massive investment in new transmission lines.</p> <p>In many countries there remains great untapped potential and Ireland is among these. Large-scale PV</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider PV as a major power source for Cork?</p>	<p>1. Sections 9.4.13 to 9.4.18 details the importance of solar energy generation schemes and indicates that the Council with support and facilitate the development of solar energy.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>integration on the Irish grid is technically feasible with a high level of security of supply, even under the most extreme weather and load conditions. Cork is ideally positioned to take advantage of this energy and technology due to irradiation levels received and geological advantages enjoyed compared to other counties in Ireland.</p> <p>Power Capital has 6.5 MW of operational plants in Northern Germany, which would have similar insulation levels in Co. Cork. Recently a 5 MW plant received approval in Co Down with construction due later this year.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Buckley, Dan dCDP14/1897</p>	<p>1. Too much of Cork is open to consideration (50%) for wind energy and a rethink requested of the Renewable Energy, Wind Energy and Pylon Network</p> <p>2. Questions whether the neighbouring counties plans investigated with regard to their wind energy policies.</p> <p>3. UK has stopped wind energy development but happy to invest in wind farms in Ireland and the people of Cork should not encourage this investment in the degradation of the countryside.</p> <p>4. Planning patterns of developers initially buildings a small number of turbines (as in west cork) and subsequently adding a larger number scar the landscape.</p> <p>5. The Monster Turbines (decision by the Planning Department to refuse overruled by County Manager) erected in</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the approach to wind energy deployment areas specifically the areas Open to Consideration (OTC) is revised as too much of Cork is open to consideration (50%) for wind energy.</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider the concerns outlined in relation to the environmental Impacts of large wind turbines and the absence of revised wind guidelines?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider public consultation?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider alternative Renewables as required in plan?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p> <p>The Draft Plan facilitates large scale wind energy development in approximately 55% of Cork County with the remaining 45% unlikely to be suitable. Any proposals in the “Open to Consideration” and “Acceptable in Principle” areas have to comply with the safeguards set out in Objectives ED 3-4 and ED 3-5.</p> <p>2. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the Planning Acts in relation to development management and plan making make sufficient provision for public consultation.</p> <p>4. Provision has been made in Section 9.4 Chapter 9 for alternative renewables.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Cork Harbour makes a farce of Cork County Council Planning System and states that these developments would not be considered in Sydney Harbour as unsightly in Cork Harbour with negative effect on tourism.</p> <p>6. Large scale wind farms should not be allowed in the absence of revised wind guidelines.</p> <p>7. The siting of wind turbines near residential properties a concerns and 2km distance at least required to an industrial turbine.</p> <p>8. Noise levels, shadow flicker and devaluation of property.</p> <p>9.Consultation required with local communities</p> <p>10.Other alternative renewable energies required in Cork so too reliant on wind energy</p> <p>11. Protect the scenic routes</p>	<p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify additional scenic routes?</p>	<p>5. The Draft CDP has identified 118 specific Scenic Routes consisting of important and valued views and prospects within the County and it is not intended to identify any further scenic routes.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	and investigate the possibility of new ones.			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Buckley, John and Buckley, Kevin dCDP14/1921</p>	<p>Extend the Coomacheo wind farm Site in Millstreet and consider additional turbines on lands surrounding the existing Coomacheo wind farm in Millstreet for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wind regime commercially viable for a wind farm. 2. Site is secluded and the proposed development unlikely to have any significant negative effect on the local or broader population (only 41 dwellings near this proposed wind farm extension with the closest dwelling 980metres). 3. Infrastructure in place with existing cable network. 4. Link roads and majority of road construction works already completed. 5. Suitable soil conditions and peat depths. 6. Importing the turbine ballasts and assembling on site shall reduce the amount of concrete to be imported to the site. 7. All wildlife has already been disturbed with existing wind 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for an extension to the Coomacheo wind farm Site in Millstreet? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" <p>The consideration of individual wind farm proposals will be dealt with on their merits through the Development Management process.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>farm.</p> <p>8. A study completed of the lands and all existing impact statements and reports in existence for this location.</p> <p>9. New and innovative way of erecting turbines shall minimise disruption to soils when developing wind farms.</p> <p>10. Provide energy from a renewable resource and will not contribute to air pollution by reducing fossil fuels and helping in achieving Irelands renewable energy targets.</p> <p>11. Socio – economic growth by improving the power supply capacity and infrastructure in the region.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Burke, Paul dCDP14/1869</p>	<p>Submission from the Knockraha Area Community Association/Environment subcommittee requesting limitations be put in place restricting future expansion of the Eirgrid / ESB Knockraha substation. Concerns as follows;</p> <p>1. Substantial piece of electrical infrastructure on this (21 acre) elevated site overlooking village in excess of 120 pylons in a 3km radius which are out of proportion.</p> <p>2. Visual amenity impact is very notable including on skyline and unacceptable cumulative effect to the degradation of visual amenity which would not comply with Holford Rules, referred to by Eirgrid / ESB as a guideline.</p> <p>3. Substantial noise of a low humming tonal nature which is a nuisance and distress to local residents.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to place limitations restricting future expansion of the Eirgrid / ESB Knockraha substation?</p>	<p>1. Any site specific developments proposed will be assessed on their merits through the Development Management process.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>4. Health & Welfare: concentration of radiated EMF and ELF fields in area.</p> <p>5. Substantial industrial/utility complex in contravention of current zoning (RHCZ) and inappropriate land use.</p> <p>6. Minor rural road in the area.</p> <p>6. Impact on property values.</p> <p>7. Curtail any possible development of agri-tourism, agri-business, tourism, heritage trails, attractive recreational amenity or rural cottage industry.</p> <p>8. No direct or indirect employment.</p> <p>9. CCC should ask Eirgrid for a Master Plan for the site and future projections.</p> <p>10. Eirgrid/ESB and CCC must ensure proper consultation</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>process for the community.</p> <p>11. EIS to be prepared for all high voltage electrical transmission projects to ensure the council is compliant with European regulations.</p> <p>12. Request an 8km exclusion zone for wind farm development.</p>			
<p>Caraden Construction Ltd dCDP14/1816</p>	<p>Requests that lands at Carewswood, Castlemartyr, Co Cork be zoned for serviced sites and includes supporting documents, outlining the rationale for the zoning.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote the zoning of particular site in Castlemartyr for the development of serviced sites?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Castlehyde Trust dCDP14/1818</p>	<p>This submission requests that RPS Ref No 01382 is delisted on the following grounds: (i) insufficient information on what is included in the record (ii) the facility being no longer known as a 'stable' facility (iii) the level of investment on</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete Castlehyde Stables from the proposed Record of Protected Structures (RPS)?</p>	<p>Castlehyde Stables form part of the original Castlehyde Estate belonging to Castlehyde House which is considered to be of National Importance on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH). The stables themselves are identified in the NIAH as being of Regional Importance and have</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>renovations to date along with the impact of conferring a protected structure status on the building and (iv) the designation of the building as a protected structure being a potential barrier to ensuring the Castlehyde Trust maximises its resources in favour of those who benefit from the Trust.</p>		<p>architectural merit and should be included on the RPS.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Clonmult Lisgoold No Pylon Group dCDP14/1728</p>	<p>Object to the ‘open to consideration’ designation of East Cork for Wind Energy ‘and propose a Normally Discouraged designation for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Impacts including light flicker, effect on human health, proximity to dwellings in rural area, negatively change ecosystems and Noise generated. 2. Community owned and operated wind farms more favourable than Private Ownership. 3. Health & Safety concerns of turbine collapsing. 4. Address Economic Justification for wind power. 5. More Wind Energy will increase our Public Service Obligation (PSO). 6. National Strategy/ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan Wind Energy Strategy Map be amended to change the zoning designation in East Cork from ‘Open to Consideration’ for Wind Energy to a “Normally Discouraged”? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider the concerns outlined in relation to the environmental Impacts of wind farms and grid infrastructure? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider alternative Renewables as required in plan? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” 2. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration. 3. Provision has been made in Section 9.4 Chapter 9 for alternative renewables. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Guidelines required prior to zoning in Plan.</p> <p>7. Tourism a concern due to the planned Grid Link Project and potential Wind Farms in the region.</p> <p>8. Fauna, migrating Birds and thoroughbred horses affected.</p> <p>9. Alternative Renewables have not been promoted in plan.</p> <p>10. Concerns in relation to European subsidies and the requirements for Energy Efficiency, targets.</p> <p>11. Why is Ireland supplying UK with Wind Energy and additional Peaking Power Plants to facilitate fluctuating power levels from Wind Energy?</p> <p>12. Proof of compliance with Aarhus Convention.</p> <p>13. Public Consultation. Local communities unaware of</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>proposals.</p> <p>14. Wind farms will justify the Grid Link Project and County Councillors are not in favour of the Project.</p> <p>15. Scenic Route S44 affected by the presence of wind turbines.</p> <p>Appendices include WHO Ecosystems & Human Well-being Health Synthesis and a map of East Cork Wind Energy Zone.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Clonmult Lisgoold No Pylon Group dCDP14/1772</p>	<p>This submission is similar to dCDP14/1728 with additional information on Public Service Obligation and Aarhus Convention.</p>	<p>See dCDP14/1728</p>	<p>See dCDP14/1728</p>	<p>See dCDP14/1728</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Cloyne District Community Council dCDP14/1847</p>	<p>Submission states the following issues should be addressed: (a)Constructive consideration of the needs of both rural youth and the elderly,(b)Difficulties of sewerage provision in small settlements,(c)Deficiencies in the rural road infrastructure (the R629),(d)Poor public transport provision in the Cloyne District and the need for solutions,(e)Lack of analysis on whether planning contributions have been put into the locations in which developments took place,(f) Cloyne should be pushed as an Historic Town and tourist routes should be directed through it,(g)East Cork generally should receive more promotion as a tourist destination. Key Villages should have been identified in the CDP rather than being left to LAPs and consideration given to possible linkages between all of them. Submission supports objective SC1-1, SC 2-1 and SC 5-3. No part of East Cork is</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify key villages in the Plan rather than being left to the LAPs?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address difficulties of sewerage provision in smaller settlements?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give additional consideration to rural public transport?</p>	<p>1. It is considered given the extensive settlement network of 45 key villages in County Cork and their supporting rural hinterlands including villages and village nuclei, that the local area plans are best placed to provide the linkages between the key villages and all of the other settlements in the settlement network. The Core Strategy makes provision for the population growth in the village network of the county.</p> <p>2. A key aim of this plan is to prioritise the delivery of water services infrastructure, in consultation with Irish Water, to meet our future population targets and support continued economic development in a balanced way which protects key environmental resources and public health.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the general statements and objectives within the Chapter 10 provide support for rural transport. It is understood that the National Transport Authority are at an advanced stage in setting up a new rural transport initiative which will operate at the County level and will have much greater integration with the local</p>	<p>1.No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>recognised as a key tourism asset - Historic Cloyne, Cork Harbour and Cobh and the East Cork coastline should be recognised. No real consideration is given to rural public transport - standard bus routes cannot be economically provided in the rural areas with dispersed populations but no consideration given to post buses, community taxi provision and sharing. There is nothing positive in the CDP which might help Cloyne with its national recognition as a Historic Town.</p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote East Cork as a tourist destination and be recognised as a key tourism asset i.e. Cork Harbour and Cobh and the East Cork coastline?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise Cloyne as a Historic Town with tourist routes directed through it?</p>	<p>authority in relation to rural transport issues.</p> <p>4. The Draft Plan identifies key tourism assets and principle attractions of national importance in the County. The Plan gives recognition to the Coastline (over 1100kms of scenic coastline and peninsulas) which includes the coastline of East Cork as a key tourist asset.</p> <p>5. Cloyne has been recognised as a Historic Town in Section 12.3 Archaeological Heritage.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Coachford Community Association dCDP14/1777</p>	<p>Requests that CDP policy should facilitate and support the implementation of village design plans and other community led projects to enhance village environments that have been prepared through a public consultation</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to facilitate and support the implementation of village design plans and other community led projects?</p>	<p>1. Objective HE 4-7 'Village Design Statements and Local Area Plans' sets out to positively facilitate the preparation and implementation of village design statements.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>process, whilst ensuring that such plans are consistent with adopted local area plans for such centres. Submission includes copy of recently finalised Coachford Village Design Statement.</p>			
<p>Coachford Community Association dCDP14/1792</p>	<p>Submission requests the route from Rooves Bridge along the Nadrid and Fergus roads along the banks of the River lee taking in the Dovecote (protected structure) and linking up with Dripsey Cross and then heading North towards Dripsey Mills and Pond, Carrignamuck castle (protected structures) to Peake Cross and West towards Aghavrin and East towards Coachford taking in Mullinhassig Waterfall and the historic area of Aghavrin including Admirals Folly (Protected structure) be included as a scenic route.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify additional scenic routes?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified 118 specific Scenic Routes consisting of important and valued views and prospects within the County and it is not intended to identify any further scenic routes.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Cohu, Anthony dCDP14/1868</p>	<p>1. This detailed submission has a number of concerns and proposals in relation to the Energy Policy including the following; Climate Change and Public Policy, Emission reduction, REAP, energy from oil and gas, onshore wind energy and methodology, socioeconomic issues, DoE guidelines.</p> <p>2. It also outlines further considerations in relation to Hydro Power, Ocean Energy, Building Energy Efficiency and Conservation, Renewable Energy in Transport/ Farming/Industry, the transmission Network and the SEA of the Draft CDP Energy Policy.</p> <p>3. States that the Energy Policy is better than its predecessors but still not a complete County Sustainable Energy Policy as too much emphasis on Sustainable Energy Consumption, Energy Conservation Measures and Efficiency of Generation. Still no Renewable Energy Strategy for</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to incorporate a Renewable Energy Strategy for the County that assesses the natural resources in terms of renewable energy potential at the most appropriate locations based on an assessment of the costs and benefits rather than the existing renewable energy objectives only?</p>	<p>1. The Energy and Renewable Energy Strategy was incorporated into the Draft Plan in Chapter 9. They were informed by the Energy Background Document published in November 2012.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the County that assesses the natural resources in terms of renewable energy potential at the most appropriate locations based on an assessment of the costs and benefits.</p> <p>4. Unjustifiable emphasis on promoting wind energy generation over other renewables and on promoting renewable energy over energy conservation.</p> <p>5. Lack of detailed data and evidence in the Energy Background Paper and the SEA to support the policy objectives.</p> <p>6. Most disconcerting are the land-use implications for such a radical programme and the sacrifices of valuable landscapes to deliver the Policy. It should be fully revised for better landscape and technology information and clear indicators with quantified and verifiable targets.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Coiste Forbartha Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh dCDP14/1779</p>	<p>1. Submission has concerns re: rural life in County Cork and states that villages such as Ballingeary need to be kept vibrant and inclusive. 2. Highlights importance of catering for inhabitant's needs through the availability of services and planning permission to rural populations. 3. Requests that the village limits extended to allow for more residential zoned land, sewage system in the village repaired and updated and a special concession given to farmers wishing to sell sites.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address difficulties of sewerage provision in smaller settlements?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1 Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands" 2. The zoning of land is a matter for the next LAP review. 3. The key aim of this plan is to prioritise the delivery of water services infrastructure, in consultation with Irish Water, to meet our future population targets and support continued economic development in a balanced way which protects key environmental resources and public health.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1 Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands" 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Colthurst, Sir Charles dCDP14/1916</p>	<p>1. The submission states that Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate are among the County's key tourism assets of National importance. It states that the Draft CDP provides no specific planning policy protection in terms of scenic, landscape and cultural heritage designations. The submission requests: 1. Designating the subject lands as an Architectural</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to designate Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate as an Architectural Conservation Area? 2. Should the Draft Plan re-instate the scenic landscape designations for Blarney Castle Estate and surrounding areas?</p>	<p>1. It is intended to include part of the village of Blarney and Blarney Castle Estate in an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). 2. It is considered that adequate provision has been made in the Draft Plan to protect sensitive landscapes and the setting of tourism attractions. When the new National Landscape Strategy currently under review is completed it may be necessary to review of the County's Draft Landscape Strategy and</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Conservation Area and 2. Re-instating the scenic landscape designations for Blarney Castle Estate and surrounding areas.</p>		<p>amend the Plan.</p>	
<p>Cook, Ted dCDP14/1717</p>	<p>1. The protection of Macroom Demesne's historic 'Double Rank' of Beech / Lime Avenue.</p> <p>2. Requests that a Landscape Conservation Area is considered for the area within the Castle grounds and notes that the Macroom District Environmental Group has been maintaining records on these species since 1983.</p> <p>3. Finally the submission objects to the wording in both the County and Town (Macroom) Development Plan secured under Variation of the Toon Valley as it argues the replacement wording expressly weakens protection for Priority SAC's and ignores NPWS commitment to the Designation</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to designate a Landscape Conservation Area in Macroom?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to prioritise the commitment to the Designation of the Toon Valley Oakwoods?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a Tree Preservation Order for Macroom Demesnes historic 'Double Rank' of Beech/Lime Avenue?</p>	<p>1. The designation of an area as a Landscape Conservation Area is not a matter for the Development Plan.</p> <p>2. The extent of the Gearagh SAC is a matter for the NPWS.</p> <p>3. Objective HE 2-5 Trees and Woodlands provides protection to mature trees/groups of mature trees and mature hedgerows that are not formally protected under Tree Preservation Order.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	of the Toon Valley Oakwoods.			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Cook, Ted dCDP14/1738</p>	<p>1) Removal of roadside hedgerow or trees exceeding 10m (Para 4.6.2) threatens species of Irish Bat, 2)'Soft Engineering' in relation to coastal protection is equally applicable to inland areas. Explain colours on figure 8.1. 3) Preservation and conservation of St Colman's Macroom. 4) Impact of wind farms including on Natura 2000 sites and queries their ability to have a net carbon benefit. 5) Contradiction between areas zoned in Figure 9-2 (Important Landscape (High) and the strategic search map proposes and adjoining area to the south as most suitable for wind farms. 6) Greater clarity is given regarding WS 6-2. 7) Backyard burning needs to be mentioned under the hazardous waste and air quality sections of the plan. 8)Heritage section of the final plan should make reference to 'endangered', 'rare or</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to reference the issue of 'backyard" burning'?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify what developments in floodplains cannot be avoided?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove the contradiction between the areas identified in Figure 9-2 Policy Considerations for Wind Energy Projects (Important Landscape (High)) and Figure 9-3 Wind Energy Strategy Map?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include planner's conditions on planting (RCI 6-1c) and retention of hedgerows?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft CDP be amended as it is considered that</p>	<p>1. The issue of 'backyard burning' is legislated for by the Waste Management Act and Regulations and the Air Pollution Act.</p> <p>2. The Draft Plan Section 11.6 and the 2011 Electoral Area Local Area Plans set out the Council's approach to flood risk management in line with the Ministerial Guidelines – "The Planning System and Flood Risk Management' and it is considered that this provides adequate guidance.</p> <p>3. It was considered that some of the area in North Cork identified as Important Landscape (High), given its particular landscape characteristics, was suitable for inclusion in the "Open to Consideration" area on the Wind Energy Strategy Map.</p> <p>4. The specific landscaping requirements for individual sites are considered on a case by case basis and are a matter for Development Management.</p> <p>5. Chapter 13 - Green infrastructure</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>threatened' to give a voice to priority SACs (Para 12.2.3) and suggests that hedgerows and trees require better protection.</p> <p>9) Importance of the County Geological Sites, maintaining conservation value is difficult in the absence of designation.</p> <p>10) Requests the Gearagh priority SAC is designated as a 'Geo-morphological Wonderland' as it remains vulnerable.</p> <p>11) Notes the importance of education in training biodiversity and makes comment that the up-river plantation forestry / clear fell and loss of field boundaries and in addition the acidifying impacts of Blanket Exotic Plantation Forestry in the headwaters of our Rivers.</p> <p>12) Draft CDP makes no reference to the Food Harvest Programme 20-20.</p>	<p>'Soft Engineering' in relation to coastal protection is equally applicable to inland areas?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage the preservation and conservation of St Colman's Church in the ownership of Macroom Town Council?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the Gearagh priority SAC is designated as a 'Geo-morphological Wonderland'?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make reference to the Food Harvest Programme 20-20?</p>	<p>encourages 'soft green solutions' to issues such as flooding across the County.</p> <p>6. The Church of Ireland (RPS 20) Castle Street is listed in the Macroom Town Plan and is therefore afforded full statutory protection.</p> <p>7. The extent of the Gearagh SAC is a matter for the NPWS.</p> <p>8. Food Harvest 2020 report is referenced in section 6.7 Rural Economy (6.7.4 – 6.7.5).</p>	<p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Cool Power Limited dCDP14/1892</p>	<p>1. Request's Cork County Council defines and implements policy to develop a sustainable solar PV electricity infrastructure as part of the development plan. 2. Sets out the involvement of Cool Power as Ireland's first authorised operator of grid connected solar PV systems and are one of only eight 'active' supply licence holders who are serving final customers in the Republic of Ireland. It is currently the largest developer and manager of rooftop PV plants in Ireland. Their solar plants include The Green Building in central Dublin and the Limerick County Hall. These sites typically produce 10% more electricity than the Photovoltaic Geographical Information System (PVGIS), which is a global standards model for solar PV generation. 3. States that solar PV technology can provide significant benefits to Ireland's long term energy requirements</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to define and implement a policy to develop a sustainable solar PV electricity infrastructure as part of the development plan?</p>	<p>1. Sections 9.4.13 – 9.4.18 details the importance of solar energy generation schemes and indicates that the Council with support and facilitate the development of solar energy.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>and the generation profile of our existing sites prove that solar PV is a viable source of electricity for the country.</p> <p>4. Advantages of large-scale solar PV growth include a reduction in the national carbon emissions, provide a viable alternative source of electricity, help decentralise the source of our electricity and provide much needed employment.</p>			
<p>Corcoran, James dCDP14/1737</p>	<p>This submission concerns the protection of the Gearagh SAC requesting that in order to prevent a continued increase in downstream flash-flooding the following wording should be included in the development plan: 'Any planning application for development within the catchments of the River Lee 'upstream of the Gearagh' or the Toon river that has the potential to impact on the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional wording as proposed for the protection of the Gearagh SAC to prevent downstream flash-flooding.</p>	<p>1. Any development located in or adjoining or in close proximity to an SAC will be subject to AA screening as part of the development management process.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>level of flexibility for residential developments.</p> <p>5. Review the Council’s current development contributions schemes.</p> <p>6. Requests that Part V should reflect actual housing need which it argues is in the region of 8%.</p> <p>7. Requests an amended Recreation and Amenity policy, which is more flexible and consistent with the Guidelines ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’.</p> <p>8. Welcomes the revised policy regarding Childcare facilities.</p> <p>9. Broadly welcomes the car parking standards, requests a textual change and that table 1a should refer to car parking spaces in every row.</p> <p>10. Request’s an objective regarding flood mapping. 10) Raises significant issues regarding retail, making reference to TCR 9-1, 4-9, 7-1 and paragraph 7.7.2, 7.10.1 and also requests that neighbourhood centres and</p>	<p>source of the options for discharge of Part V?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the Recreation and Amenity policy, be made more flexible and consistent with the ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ Guidelines?</p> <p>6. Supports the Childcare Provision policy.</p> <p>7. Should the Core Strategy be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include an objective regarding future mapping of areas at risk of flooding?</p>	<p>Environment methodology. It is expected that this will be reviewed in the coming year and when the corresponding legislative measures are put in place the County and City Council will take appropriate action as required. The options for the discharge of Part V are taken from Circular 11 /2012.</p> <p>5. During the lifetime of the Plan consideration will be given to reviewing the Recreation and Amenity policy.</p> <p>6). Noted.</p> <p>7). See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>8. It is considered that the Council has outlined its intention to update the flood maps as new information becomes available as set out in paragraph 11.6.8 of the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>large village centres are unnamed and submit that known centres should be identified within table 7.1</p>	<p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise workforce population in relation to convenience retailing?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional text which provides for the full occupancy of established retail warehousing locations e.g. Little Island?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be</p>	<p>9. The approach to retail provision in the Draft Plan is based on the Retail Planning Guidelines. Any applications for additional convenience facilities within the Metropolitan Area will be considered on their merits. The designation within the retail hierarchy relates primarily to population base rather than employment base as retail expenditure is much more closely aligned with resident population than employment numbers.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to meet the retail needs of local workforce populations, however it is not appropriate to over provide in such locations in order to draw customers in from other residential areas.</p> <p>10) Consideration will be given to providing additional text to support the occupancy of existing retail warehousing in preference to providing new retail warehousing floorspace. Established retail warehousing locations have been recognised within the Joint Retail Study.</p> <p>11) It is considered appropriate to only</p>	<p>9. Amendment Required.</p> <p>10. Amendment Required</p> <p>11). No Amendment</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
		<p>amended to identify neighbourhood centres in Table 7.1?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify Table 7.2 “Floorspace-Proposed distribution of 2022 quantum for Metropolitan Area”?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan include a minor amendment to Note 4 in Appendix C ,Table 1a regarding car parking reduction?</p> <p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to refer in Appendix C Table 1a to car parking spaces in every row to provide clarity of interpretation?</p>	<p>list neighbourhood centres within the Metropolitan Retail Study and not the Strategy as they are not of a strategic nature. The next review of the Local Area Plans can identify new and existing neighbourhood centres where appropriate.</p> <p>12) It is intended to revise Table 7.2 in order to improve clarity.</p> <p>13) It is intended to amend Note 4 by adding additional text to recognise the contribution of good public transport availability.</p> <p>14) It is intended to amend Appendix C Table 1a accordingly.</p>	<p>Required</p> <p>12) Amendment Required.</p> <p>13) Amendment Required</p> <p>14) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Cork Chamber dCDP14/1888</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the draft County Development Plan’s accomplishments, there are a number of areas where the Chamber believes revisions/further developments or recommendations are required to ensure the realisation of the Plan’s vision.</p> <p>1. Provide clear governance and implementation structures for population targets and zoned lands; economy and employment; town centres & retail; tourism; energy and digital economy; transport; water services and waste.</p> <p>2. The development of joint city/county regional strategies where an integrated approach to policy development will benefit specific challenges.</p> <p>3. Implementation of specific engagement structures with key actors across the Atlantic Gateway Initiative to strengthen support for cross-</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to further strengthen linkages with other ongoing local and strategic economic initiatives currently being undertaken in the county?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for the preparation of an Economic Development Strategy with particular reference to the modern day needs of the key knowledge-economy industry sectors, indigenous companies (agri-food and blue growth) and other key growth sectors?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to set out a clear policy to continue to monitor how population targets are being met within the strategic planning areas of both the City and County and seek adjustments if necessary to ensure the timely incorporation of amendments so that appropriate infrastructure is put in place to meet demographic</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the Draft Plan already allows for strong links with other local and strategic economic initiatives.</p> <p>2. It is considered that when the Regional Spatial and Economic Plan is published by the Regional Assembly it may be necessary to amend this plan. In addition, the Local Economic and Community Plans (LECP) currently being prepared will have a statutory obligation regarding the promotion of economic and enterprise across economic sectors, including both FDI and Indigenous Industry.</p> <p>3. It is intended to make additional provision for monitoring in Chapter 15, including the monitoring of the population targets.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>county priority issues;</p> <p>4. The underpinning of the employment and economy chapter with a clear strategy that addresses and facilitates optimal strategic planning responses for key businesses across the county landscape.</p> <p>5. Key infrastructural requirements of businesses that should be prioritised within the plan and specific recommendations regarding strategic employment sites.</p>	<p>and commercial requirements?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Objective ZU 3-7 to better reflect national waste management policy?</p> <p>6. Should Plan be amended to recognise the critical importance of the Lower Lee Flood Relief Scheme and support the efficient implementation of the final proposed flood defence measures?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify that the Retail Background Paper is for general information only?</p>	<p>4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)“Core Strategy” A ”Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>5. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p> <p>6. The final Lee CFRAM has not been published to date and it may be necessary to amend the Plan when it is finalised. The Council has outlined its intention to update the flood maps as new information becomes available in paragraph 11.6.8 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>7. The Town Centre Study reports were commissioned as part of background work in the preparation of the Draft Plan. They were intended to give an</p>	<p>4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A ”Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>5. Amendment Required</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider co-location of convenience retail in areas of significant workforce populations whilst having regard to potential conflicts with established neighbourhood centres?</p>	<p>overall impression of town centres including the wider retail landscape of the county. Individual proposals from retail applicants will be considered on their merits and primarily informed by the accompanying Retail Impact Assessments.</p> <p>8. The approach to retail provision in the Draft Plan is based on the Retail Planning Guidelines. Any applications for additional convenience facilities within the Metropolitan Area will be considered on their merits. The designation within the retail hierarchy relates primarily to population base rather than employment base as retail expenditure is much more closely aligned with resident population than employment numbers.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to meet the retail needs of local workforce populations, however it is not appropriate to over provide in such locations in order to draw customers in from other</p>	<p>8. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to premise future development of Cork Airport and Little Island on the delivery of improved non-vehicular transportation modes?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the N28 Upgrade as an important catalyst for enhancing the development of the Ringaskiddy/Carrigaline industrial cluster and wider regional economic development?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to manage the N40 to support economic growth and not just to protect capacity alone? The Plan should incorporate associated proposals?</p>	<p>residential areas.</p> <p>9. The approach to these locations is clearly set out in the Plan. Cork Airport and Little Island have a target all-day frequency of 15 minutes bus/rail service improvements.</p> <p>10. Objective EE6-2: Cork harbour supports the upgrade of the N28 to accommodate the expansion of Ringaskiddy Port. Objective TM3-1 recognises the N28 as a Project Critical to the Delivery of Planned Development in the Cork Area.</p> <p>11. The N40 Demand Management Study is underway. The N40 is critical to the national road network serving Cork City and connections to Cork Airport, Port of Cork, Ringaskiddy, Cork Science Park, West Cork and South Kerry. The N40 Demand Management Study will look at all options for the management of the N40 including both controlling traffic on the route</p>	<p>9. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>10. No Amendment Required</p> <p>11. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to incorporate proposals to support the Government's target that 10% of Ireland's vehicles be electric by 2020 by facilitating the roll out of charging infrastructure for electric vehicles?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the National Energy Hub, Whitegate be categorised as an 'open for consideration' area for wind energy?</p>	<p>and managing the demand for traffic to use the road as well as possible targeted infrastructure improvement to ensure the capacity along the N40 is protected over its design life as future planned demand rises.</p> <p>12. It is considered that Para 9.5.3 "Renewable Energy in Transport" and Note 9 in Appendix C Table 1(a) provide good support to encourage electric vehicles and help meet Governments targets.</p> <p>13. Section 9.3 On-shore Wind Energy and objective ED 3-7 Other Wind Energy Developments including section 9.3.16 specifically indicates that Proposals for the generation and consumption of electricity in a single premises will be considered on their merits in all areas of the County including the Strategic Employment Areas around Cork Harbour (Whitegate, Ringaskiddy, Carrigtwohill,</p>	<p>12. No Amendment Required</p> <p>13. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to commit to strategic planning which supports connectivity to subsea fibre to enable Tier 1 connectivity across the Atlantic Gateway region?</p>	<p>Kilbarry, Little Island). Therefore there is no need to amend Figure 9-3 Wind Energy Strategy Map.</p> <p>14. Chapter 9, Section 9.7 Digital Economy and Objective ED 7-2 makes a strong commitment to the delivery of Information and Communication Technology for the County.</p>	<p>14.No Amendment Required</p>
<p>Cork City Council Traveller Accommodation Unit dCDP14/1750</p>	<p>It is proposed that Cork City Council in conjunction with Cork County Council explore options to meet the needs of the residents of the unauthorised halting site on Nash's Boreen with the aim of identifying a suitable site within the area. It is noted that that the current unauthorised site on Nash's Boreen is on Cork City Council lands but within Cork County Councils administrative boundary, it is</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide more specific guidance on the provision of Traveller Accommodation during the lifetime of the plan?</p>	<p>1. The identification of specific sites for traveller accommodation is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>therefore requested that Cork County Council include an objective that sites/areas be used specifically for the provision of traveller accommodation.</p>			
<p>Cork Dockyard Holdings Ltd. dCDP14/1910</p>	<p>Submission states that the importance and contribution of the Cork Dockyard site is not fully reflected and therefore proposes an amendment to the Draft CDP to reflect a more positive context for the Cork Dockyard site. Therefore, the submission requests that Table 15.1 be amended to (a) recognise the existing contribution and development potential of Cork Dockyard, (b) optimise the future potential of the site by including a positive constructive framework and (c) acknowledge the significant potential the site has in relation to renewable energy and part of the overall strategy of promoting Cork Harbour as an</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the plan be amended to reflect a more positive context for the Cork Dockyard site? 2. Can the plan be amended to optimise the future potential of the site by including a positive constructive framework and acknowledge the significant potential the site has in relation to renewable energy? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appropriate plan response to the future development of this site will be set out in the next LAP review. 2. The appropriate plan response to the future development of this site will be set out in the next LAP review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	international energy hub.			
Cork Education and Training Board dCDP14/1893	The submission firstly welcomes the provisions of the draft County Development Plan and also relates to the need for proper planning for the provision of schools at primary school and post primary levels and the provision of further education and training services in County Cork. It also deals with the role of Cork Education and Training Board in the better coordination and provision of education and training services in the County. The submission also includes information on the Cork ETB Major Capital Projects for 2014.	1. This submission is broadly supportive of the policies included in the Draft Plan.	1. Noted	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Cork Environmental Forum dCDP14/1884</p>	<p>This submission relates to Volume Three: Environment and Natura Impact Reports that accompany the Draft Plan and outlines concerns and issues in relation to: Fresh Water Pearl Mussel, Sewage and Waste Water Treatment, Energy/Climate Change, Wind Energy, Transport, Housing, Climate Change Adaptation, the Planning Scenarios. Concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state of the FWPM Populations, protected riparian zones and management of river banks needed, clearer classification of the river water bodies, dredging should not be allowed in FWPM SPA Natura 2000 sites, Sewage and WWT standards not met, upgrading of sewage treatment works required and Infrastructural Investment and prioritization. 2. Energy/Climate Change section welcomed. 3. Lack of liaison/dialogue between local communities and the wind farm industry. A much 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should The Draft Plan be amended so that Riparian zones of at least 20m should be established within FWPM designated sites? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the main settlements should have their waste water treatment systems upgraded as soon as possible (Clonakilty and works in Blackwater are referenced in particular)? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make provision for a diversified energy mix as more than onshore wind needs to be considered i.e. off shore wind and wave and the on-shore infrastructure? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make provision for a feasibility study to check the viability of carbon sequestration and storage using the Kinsale depleting gas fields? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is intended to revise Objective WS 5-2 to apply restriction to development adjacent to watercourses to all land outside urban areas, not just zoned land. 2. It is intended to include additional text to revise Table 11.1 and Objective WS 2-1 in Chapter 11 and revise Critical Infrastructure Tables 15.1 and 15.2 in Chapter 15. 3. The Strategy in Chapter 9 sets out policies and objectives for other Renewable Energy Sources and encourages a diversified mix of energy sources. 4. The Draft Plan has recognised the future potential of gas storage and carbon capture facilities at Kinsale Gas Field. It is not the intention at this stage to carry out a feasibility study on the viability of carbon sequestration and storage using the Kinsale depleting gas 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendment required. 2. Amendment required. 3. No Amendment Required. 4. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>more cohesive, inclusive, and cooperative process is needed.</p> <p>4. Diversified energy mix, more than onshore wind needs to be considered i.e. off shore wind and wave and the on shore infrastructure.</p> <p>5. Viability of carbon sequestration and storage using the Kinsale depleting gas fields needs to have a feasibility study.</p> <p>6. Sustainable/ green building techniques should be promoted in housing including better insulation and initiatives like the NEES project.</p> <p>7. Consider eco communities.</p> <p>8. CEF welcomes the new Energy Performance of Buildings Directive and suggests greater support for e-working, car sharing technology, and electric vehicles.</p>	<p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote sustainable/ green building techniques in housing?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider eco communities?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to show greater support for e-working, car sharing technology and electric vehicles?</p>	<p>fields.</p> <p>5. Section 9.5 Building Energy Efficiency and Objective ED 5-1 Building Energy Efficiency Conservation encourages innovative new building design and retrofitting of existing buildings where possible, to improve building energy efficiency, energy conservation and the use of renewable energy sources in accordance with national regulations and policy requirements.</p> <p>6. Cork County has an extensive settlement network and any changes will be a matter for the next LAP review.</p> <p>7. It is considered that Para 9.5.3 “Renewable Energy in Transport” and Note 9 in Appendix C Table 1a provide good support to encourage electric vehicles and help meet Governments targets.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Cork Environmental Forum Transport and Mobility Forum dCDP14/1885</p>	<p>Duplicate of Submission 1884 outlining concerns in relation to a number of topics. The transport concerns are solely outlined in this submission.</p> <p>1. Delivering a sustainable transport network is a huge challenge and linked to the existing dispersed settlement pattern. Biggest impact would be in providing better connectivity and integration, through networks of public transport services and enhanced infrastructure such as Park and Ride, cycle paths, footpaths, within the Metropolitan area.</p> <p>2. Within the lifetime of the Plan it would be good to see the extension of the Active Travel Town Walking and Cycling Strategies extended to the 22 other main towns.</p> <p>3. In relation to Mobility Management Plans, as most businesses in SMEs in the towns would employ less than 50</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide for better connectivity and integration, through networks of public transport services?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to extend Active Travel Town Walking and Cycling Strategies to 22 other main towns?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise downwards the limit for Mobility Management Plans or provide a coordinated mobility plan for clusters of SMEs where there is a high car dependency?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make the old railway line in West Cork into a cycleway?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that cycle routes are an integral part of green infrastructure?</p>	<p>1. The objectives and general provisions of the Transport and Mobility chapter generally support further development, enhancement and improvement of the public transport network and services.</p> <p>2. Objective TM 2-2 of the Plan already states that ‘Local Area Plans will set out Active Travel Strategies (cycling and walking) for individual towns and their hinterlands.’</p> <p>3. It is considered that the current requirement of 50 is appropriate and the text and objectives of the plan in this regard are adequate.</p> <p>4. It is considered that adequate support is given to the promotion of Walking/Cycling routes in section 8.7 Walking/Cycling.</p> <p>5. Cycleways are considered part of Green Infrastructure and there are sufficient linkages between the Green Infrastructure and Environment and Tourism Chapters.</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required</p> <p>2) No Amendment Required</p> <p>3) No Amendment Required</p> <p>4.No Amendment Required</p> <p>5.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>people the limit should be revised downwards or provide a coordinated mobility plan for clusters of SMEs where there is a high car dependency.</p> <p>4. Making the old railway line in West Cork into a cycleway considered to have tourism potential.</p> <p>5. Cycle routes should be an integral part of green infrastructure and cycle paths should be provided to edge and out of town business parks, shopping centres and other facilities in all 26 larger towns.</p>		<p>– see 13.4 Countryside Recreation.</p>	
<p>Coughlan, Gillian dCDP14/1815</p>	<p>This submission proposes the inclusion of the Bandon Town Wall Conservation, Interpretation and Management Plan as well as the Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bandon.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include ‘the Bandon Town Wall Conservation, Interpretation and Management Plan’ as well as the Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bandon?</p>	<p>This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Crean, John dCDP14/1835</p>	<p>Submission in relation to rural housing policy states that persons with bona fides arguments to justify housing needs, these persons are being either denied housing opportunities due to the fact that they do not strictly confirm to policy criteria and exceptions. Interpretation of policy by Council officers could represent the creation of an evolving policy framework that subverts the purpose of the Development Plan. Submission requests additional text and additional categories to five rural housing policy area types in relation to returning emigrants, landowners transferring the family home to son / daughter, rural business and persons taking over the ownership of a family farm. States that alterations proposed will make for a more equitable application of housing policy and one that is more consistent with the objectives and provisions of Circular SP5/08.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Concern that family member living within the County may be treated differently than family members living outside of Cork under the Council's proposed policies addressing the rights and entitlements of emigrants.</p>			
<p>Creedon, Teddy dCDP14/1828</p>	<p>Reconsider the lands south of Mullaghanish between the townlands of Coomnaclohy and Coomnaguire, Ballyvourney as a potential zone and location for wind energy for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unsuitable for farming and considered suitable for producing wind 2. The majority of the lands are not within the SPA with only a small part of the lands in the SPA 3. The hen harrier and wind 	<p>Should the Draft Plan reconsider the lands south of Mullaghanish between the townlands of Coomnaclohy and Coomnaguire, Ballyvourney as a potential area and location for wind energy?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>turbines have co-existed without any adverse environmental and ecological issues for a number of years</p> <p>4. There are two wind turbines existing on lands at this location and many turbines have been erected in adjoining lands in West Cork and East Kerry – see 07/306, 04/3152, 10/465 and 06/1680 all situated in Clydaghroe.</p> <p>5. Infrastructure in place and two Eirgrid substations in the area at Garrow and Caherdowney.</p> <p>6. The subject lands do not contribute water to river associated with the Lough Leane catchment area as they face east.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Cronin, Thecla and Sheehan, Mary dCDP14/1770</p>	<p>This submission relates to the future development of Crosshaven and it sets out a number of the settlement's current attractions including the tourism facilities, walk/cycle ways linking the village to the bays, Fort Camden and requests that this site is further developed as a historic and tourist site. In addition, it requests that the shoreline vistas are protected and request that the development of a niche boat building enterprise with a historic/museum type project should be encouraged. A further public slipway access at the entrance to the village (west) adjacent to present car-park and further major infill of Crosshaven's shoreline and a boardwalk type development inside of the shoreline wall along the village end of Point Road and the re-configuration of the shore-edge of the village square infrastructure requirements. Finally, a</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote local infrastructural improvements to Crosshaven Village Centre? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage the further development of Fort Camden site as a historic and tourist site? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge the future development of Crosshaven and the settlement's current attractions and tourism facilities? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a matter for the next LAP review. 2. The redevelopment of Spike Island and Fort Camden Meagher as tourist attractions have been recognised in paragraph 8.3.3 of Chapter 8: Tourism. 3. This is a matter for the next LAP review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>that local community organisations /clubs have concerns about their sustainability if young people have to leave the parish. Affordable sites should be provided for young people in the parish. Farming families should get priority in getting planning permission. Requests that the following text 'sufficient housing development needs to be approved to satisfy demand from parishioner's to maintain our vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>provision for affordable sites within villages?</p>	<p>sites within villages is outside the scope of the County Development Plan.</p>	
<p>Cumann Luthchleas Gael, Coiste Chontae Chorcaí Roinn Iar Dheisceart dCDP14/1732</p>	<p>This submission requests that the County Development Plan should give the planning process the freedom to allow the people to live in their communities by developing a strategy of a more lenient and practical approach to planning applications, especially for dwellings up to 2,000sq ft. The submission argues that if a new</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands”.</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands”.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>approach to our rural housing needs is not grasped, then our traditional rural communities will disappear and local people will be forced to emigrate or migrate to the larger urban areas and notes that rural communities have already lost local services. The submission states that in order for rural communities to survive and by extension, local GAA clubs to prosper it is paramount that a benign planning regime is implemented thereby allowing local people set up home in their own areas.</p>			
<p>Davis, Liam dCDP14/1858</p>	<p>States that the subject lands do not conform to the proposed “Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Green Belt” as they are not prominent or strategic in nature. Requests that the subject Greenbelt lands be incorporated within the development boundary. States that simply allocating all A1 lands to the new zoning is not appropriate in all cases and a full review of the A1 lands</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt Map be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan Rural</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified the importance of protecting prominent areas of the Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt which are of strategic importance to the purpose and function of the greenbelt and greenbelt settlements. These areas are made up of prominent open hilltops, valley sides and ridges which give Metropolitan Cork its distinctive character and the Plan recognises the importance of protecting these areas. 2. The issue of the zoning of land is a</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required 2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>does appear to have taken place in advance of the Draft Plan being published.</p>	<p>Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>matter for the next LAP review.</p>	
<p>de Haas, Nigel dCDP14/1712</p>	<p>This submission outlines a number of concerns in relation to wind energy policy;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on obsolete and incorrect assumptions as 2006 Guidelines overtaken by technical development. 2. Plan extols the county as having the highest commissioned wind generation capacity of all counties which considered an unnecessary burden on the public and threatens the unspoiled Irish nature. Sufficient to play an equal part with all counties. 3. Clarification of Objective ED 1-1 Requested. 4. Objective ED 1-2 considered crucial. 5. Expansion of Section 9.2.1 requested. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to update the 2006 Guidelines as they are considered obsolete and dated? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider whether all counties should have an equal share in accommodating wind farms developments, given the different environmental capacities of counties to accommodate such developments? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The revision of Ministerial Guidelines is outside the scope of the Development Plan Review process. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration. 2. The Wind Energy Strategy Map is based on consideration of a number of criteria and key policy considerations including wind speeds and the need to protect Natura 2000/nature conservation sites, high value landscape, urban areas and the areas considered suitable/unsuitable in adjoining counties. Each planning application will be dealt with on its merits in relation to national guidelines and strategies outlined in the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>6. Section 9.2.2 claims that renewable energy delivers new jobs to the economy which considered a misrepresentation in the case of wind as manufacturing jobs in Europe with limited jobs in construction and maintenance in Ireland.</p> <p>7. Section 9.2.4 considered an excellent objective provided the overall net carbon benefit evaluated.</p> <p>8. Section 9.2.5 considered an unsupportable assertion.</p> <p>9. Section 9.2.6 references the NREAP which now subject to doubt.</p> <p>10. Section 9.3.3 references the 2006 Guidelines which are dated.</p> <p>11. Section 4.3 of the guidelines in relation to grid connection is a direct infringement of rights of property owners. Separation distances from residential properties inadequate.</p> <p>12. Section 5.6 of the guidelines makes no reference to low frequency noise in wind farms. Requests Cork County Council</p>	<p>3. Should Objective ED 1-1 be clarified?</p> <p>4. Should Objective ED 1-2 be considered crucial?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge the fact that Renewable Energy will not deliver jobs to the economy?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended as Section 9.2.5 considered an unsupportable assertion i.e. County Cork is well positioned to become self-sufficient in renewable energy?</p> <p>7. Section 9.2.6 references the NREAP which now subject to doubt and Section 9.3.3 references the 2006 Guidelines which are dated.</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address separation distances from residential</p>	<p>Draft Plan.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the current wording should be retained in order to provide for balanced development.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. It is considered that renewable energy developments do both deliver jobs to the economy and help protect existing jobs.</p> <p>6. It is considered that a combination of renewable energy sources will allow Cork to become self sufficient.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p> <p>8. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national</p>	<p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	to contribute to updating the guidelines to reflect current equipment. Appendices include Spiegel Online Green Fade-Out by G.P Schmitz 2014.	properties? 9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make reference to low frequency noise from wind farms?	targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration. 9. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.	9. No Amendment Required.
De Vere Hunt, A., Kelly, D., Kelly, A., Mc Sweeney, P. dCDP14/1743	Request that lands be designated a 'preferred location' for wind farm development in the Development Plan as outlined. The designation is requested for the following reasons: 1. Lands are elevated to 1,600 ft on the Cork/Kerry border and	1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the lands on the Cork/Kerry border be designated a 'preferred location' for wind farm development?	1. The Wind Energy Strategy Map is based on consideration of a number of criteria and key policy considerations including wind speeds and the need to protect Natura 2000/nature conservation sites, high value landscape, urban areas and the areas considered suitable / unsuitable in adjoining counties. The area in question appears to be in the	1. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>have the benefit of very high wind speeds.</p> <p>2. Lands are not designated SAC or NHA and are not in a Natura 2000 area.</p> <p>3. Grid connections and substations in place.</p> <p>4. Precedent set for wind farms in area as adjacent to constructed Sillahertane Wind Farm in Kerry and close to the permitted Kilgarvan Wind Farm with a total of 100MW of operational wind farm and 60MW permitted in area.</p> <p>5. Precedent for telecommunication infrastructure also in area.</p> <p>6. Lands are unsuitable for agriculture and forestry on part of the subject lands is not of good quality.</p>		<p>Open to Consideration Area where wind energy development will be considered on their merits.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht dCDP14/1821</p>	<p>The Department notes the principles and objectives contained within the Plan that relates to Cork's Archaeological and Built Heritage, specifically in Chapter 8 Tourism and Chapter 12 Heritage. The submission continues by raising the following points:</p> <p>Tourism (1) Section 8.1.3 should make reference to a well presented and adequately protected built environment (2) Section 8.2.1 National Monuments should also be mentioned (3) Make reference to Underwater Heritage implications/impacts (4) General comment - the Council should devise policy/guidelines in liaison with the department with regard to tourism signage, also reference James Fort, Charlesfort and other monuments in the harbour region.</p> <p>Energy and Digital Economy (5) It is recommended that</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that Section 8.1.3 makes reference to a well presented and adequately protected built environment.</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that in Section 8.2.1 - where referring to Nationally significant tourism assets, should the National Monuments of the County also be included.</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise and be aware of possible Underwater Heritage implications/impacts with regard to enhancing and improving water-based tourism?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include policy/guidelines (prepared in liaison with this Department) with regard to tourism signage to ensure that they are not overly intrusive/ inappropriate?</p> <p>5. Should the co-ordination of enhancing Spike Island's and Fort</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the need to maintain a high quality built environment is dealt with in Chapter 12 Heritage.</p> <p>2. It is considered that sufficient acknowledgement is given to the importance of National Monuments in sections 12.3.5 and 12.3.6.</p> <p>3. Chapter 12: Heritage and section 12.3/ objective HE3-2 on Underwater Archaeology acknowledge the importance of maritime/riverine heritage.</p> <p>4. Section 8.9 Tourism Developments and Facilities details the importance of tourist signage – see section 8.9.6 and 8.9.7.</p> <p>5. Section 8.5 Heritage Tourism details how the transfer of Spike Island to CCC</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Archaeological Landscape Impact Assessment be carried out in advance of zoning/planning approval (including Visual Amenity Impact Assessments).</p> <p>Heritage (6) Section 12.3.2 need to reference the sites that are visible / upstanding in the landscape (7) Section 12.3.5 change wording to reflect the National Monuments Act (8) Continue to support and advise on the Archaeology in the Classroom Programme by including objective and include map of Zones of Archaeological Potential for the Urban Centres in the appendices.</p>	<p>Camden Meagher's tourism potential and also include reference to James Fort and Charlesfort and other monuments in the harbour region?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge the wealth of archaeological monuments in the upland areas of Cork County (that may be affected by Renewable Energy Schemes) and address impacts in individual monuments?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that an Archaeological Landscape Impact Assessment is carried out in advance of zoning/planning approval? This should also include Visual Amenity Impact Assessments, with particular reference to upland prehistoric</p>	<p>has enabled the County Council to progress the development. The Forts around the harbour have been recognised as principle tourism attractions in Section 8.3. Various stakeholders are working together to promote the tourist potential of Cork Harbour.</p> <p>6. Section 12.3 Archaeological Heritage acknowledges the wealth of archaeological monuments identified in Cork County and associated objectives provide adequate protection to monuments.</p> <p>7. The requirement for Archaeological Landscape Impact Assessment shall be dealt with on a case-by-case basis via the development management process.</p>	<p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>sites which may have solar/lunar/landscape orientations that could be affected by developments even at a great distance away?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge that while many sites are not visible above ground and survive beneath current ground levels, many more are upstanding and visible in the landscape, and this needs to be included?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended (specifically Section 12.3.5) to insert 'at or in relation to', not 'proximity to' so as to match the actual wording in the National Monuments Act regarding notification of works?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended with an objective continuing to support and advise on the Archaeology in the Classroom programme as well as</p>	<p>8. Section 12.3 Archaeological Heritage - acknowledges both above and below ground archaeological monuments.</p> <p>9. It is intended to revise the text to reflect the correct wording.</p> <p>10. It is not considered a strategic objective or appropriate for the development plan to include such an objective. Pre- planning advice is</p>	<p>8. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>9. Amendment required.</p> <p>10. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>advising on community heritage projects?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include maps of the Zones of Archaeological Potential for the Urban Centres (as considered a benefit by the DAHG) in the appendices? Bandon, Buttevant, Castlemartyr, Clonakilty, Cloyne, Cobh, Fermoy, Glanworth, Inishannon, Kinsale, Liscarroll, Macroom, Mallow, Middleton, Rosscarbery, Skibbereen, Youghal.</p>	<p>available from the Heritage Unit of Cork County Council for proposed heritage projects.</p> <p>11. Section 12.3.10 and objective HE 3-3: Zones of Archaeological Potential provide adequate protection and the SMR database www.archaeology.ie</p>	<p>11. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht dCDP14/1922</p>	<p><u>Nature Conservation</u> 1. States that in order to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive, CCC must ensure that further development in the Upper Blackwater will not adversely affect high level of water quality required for the freshwater pearl mussel. 2. States that in order to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive, CCC must ensure further development discharging to the Great Island Channel SAC will not adversely affect the Natura Site. 3. States that in order to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive, CCC must ensure that provision of the upgrade of the R624 (Cobh) can proceed without adverse effects on the Great Island Channel SAC. 4. States that in order to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive, CCC must ensure development proposed in</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that further development in the Upper Blackwater will not adversely affect high level of water quality required for the freshwater pearl mussel? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that discharging to the Great Island Channel SAC will not adversely affect the Natura Site? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that provision of the upgrade of the R624 (Cobh) can proceed without adverse effects on the Great Island Channel SAC?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B “Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments” 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B “Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments” 3. There are a number of infrastructure constraints affecting the level of development that can be accommodated in Cobh Town in particular waste water treatment and road access. However, the delivery of the Lower Harbour Towns Waste Water Scheme in 2016 will remove one of these constraints. Therefore, in order to build on that public investment it is very important that road access between the town of Cobh and the national road network is upgraded to</p>	<p>1 See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B “Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments” 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B “Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments” 3. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>Dunmanway will not adversely affect the Bandon River SAC.</p> <p><u>Sustainable development</u> 5. Requests reference to sustainable development to be included in objectives relating to delivery of infrastructure; TO 1-2, TO-71, ED 1-1, ED 4-3, ED 6-3, ED 7-1, TM 2-1, TM 2-2 (a) and (d), TM 3-1 (a) and (b), TM 5-2 (f), TM 6-1 (b), WS 4-1 (a), RC 9-2, EE 9-1.</p> <p><u>Screening for strategies and recommendations to be implemented</u> 6. States that objective HOU 1-1 Joint Housing Strategy must be screened if objective to implement this strategy is to be included in CDP.</p> <p>7.WS 6-1 states that SW CFRAM Study must be screened if objective to implement this is to be included in CDP</p> <p><u>Housing Objectives</u></p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that development proposed in Dunmanway will not adversely affect the Bandon River SAC?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include word “sustainable development” in a list of objectives TO 1-2, TO-71, ED 1-1, ED 4-3, ED 6-3, ED 7-1, TM 2-1, TM 2-2 (a) and (d), TM 3-1 (a)</p>	<p>accommodate the additional growth proposed. A balance between the need for improved road access and the need to ensure that any proposals do not adversely affect Natura Sites needs to be carefully considered. It is therefore proposed to remove specific reference to the upgrading of the R624 and replace it with a commitment in a broader objective that allows consideration of all the possible road infrastructure options available and be subject to full ecological assessment.</p> <p>4. The Council are currently working with other stakeholders in particular Irish Water and the National Parks and Wildlife Service to address this issue which relates to the location of the outfall pipe from the WWTP. It is considered that additional text will be required to address this issue.</p> <p>5. The term “sustainable development” is included in the preamble to the Principle Act therefore the plan is required by law to provide for sustainable development. In order to reinforce this point “Sustainability” has been identified as a</p>	<p>4. Amendment required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>8.HOU 3-1 (c) – needs to be clarified – relates to urban footpaths, not recreational paths along rivers etc</p> <p>Rural Objectives</p> <p>9. Should RCI 4-6 in the Draft Plan relating to Structurally Weaker Rural Areas, be amended to include an option for refusal of developments which could, by their location have adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites?</p> <p>10. Should objective RCI 4-8 in the Draft Plan relating to exceptional health circumstances be amended, to include qualification that developments permitted under this policy need to be subject to compliance with environmental policies and objectives of the plan?</p> <p>11. Should objective RCI 7-4 in the Draft Plan be amended to include text to ensure no damage to be caused to sites</p>	<p>and (b), TM 5-2 (f), TM 6-1 (b), WS 4-1 (a), RC 9-2, EE 9-1?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to take account whether or not the Joint Housing Strategy and the SW CFRAM Study have been screened for AA?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify HOU 3-1(c)?</p>	<p>Development Plan Principle in Chapter 1, Para 1.2.6 and the following text has been included “Any reference to development in this plan should be considered to refer to sustainable development”. Therefore it is considered that this issue has been comprehensively dealt with.</p> <p>6. The key elements of the Joint Housing Strategy are included in Chapter 2 “Core Strategy”, Chapter 3 “Housing” and Appendix B. All of these have been subject to full SEA and AA.</p> <p>The Lee CFRAM Study Natura Impact Statement is currently with the DAHG DAU and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for a 6-week consultation (29.04.14 - 10.06.2014) after which OPW will prepare the AA Conclusion Statement and publish the Final CFRMP. The Draft Plan will be amended if necessary.</p> <p>7. It is recommended that requested clarification be provided in text of objective.</p>	<p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>used by strictly protected wildlife?</p> <p>12. Should objective RCI 8-3 (c) of the Draft Plan be amended to ensure compliance with Habitats Directive?</p> <p>13. RCI 9-4 some uninhabited islands used by breeding seabirds and breeding seals will require access restrictions during the breeding season.</p> <p><u>Energy Objectives</u></p> <p>14. ED 1-3 Objective is well worded.</p> <p>15. ED 3-2 Inconsistent wording refers to areas 'unsuitable' for wind energy, differs from map and policy.</p> <p>16. ED 3-5 (Areas open to consideration for wind energy). States that full AA is required for this objective in relation to certain Natura sites, as they are identified as falling into this zone.</p>	<p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise RCI 4-6 relating to Structurally Weaker Rural Areas to include an option for refusal for developments which could, by their location have adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise RCI 4-8?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise RCI 7-4?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise RCI 8-3(c)?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise RCI 9-4?</p>	<p>8. It is considered that the wording of RCI 4-6 in relation to the protection of environmentally sensitive areas is sufficient. It is intended to revise the text of paragraph 4.3.10 to highlight environmental constraints in this area.</p> <p>9. It is intended to include additional text to Section 4.4 to ensure that it is clear that all objectives in this section are assessed in conjunction with all other policies and objectives in the plan.</p> <p>10. It is intended to include additional text to objective RCI 7-4 to address this issue.</p> <p>11. It is considered that the current objective is strong enough to ensure no adverse impact on Natura 2000 Sites.</p> <p>12. It is intended to add an additional paragraph after Para 4.9.7 to clarify this</p>	<p>8. Amendment Required.</p> <p>9. Amendment Required.</p> <p>10. Amendment Required.</p> <p>11. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>12. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>17. ED 3-7 grammatical errors.</p> <p>18. ED 4-1 typo.</p> <p>19. ED 6-1 Recommends that infrastructure connection to wind farms is fully assessed as part of the wind farm and renewable energy application to avoid project splitting.</p> <p><u>Tourism Objectives</u></p> <p>20. TO 9-1 (b) note that in some designated sites there may be no environmental capacity for tourism related developments.</p> <p>21. TO 9-1 (c) include reference to requirement for environmental assessment of any such developments as required.</p> <p>22. TO 9-2 (d) retail developments may not be suitable in a number of natural semi natural tourist attractions</p>	<p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise ED 1-3?</p> <p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise ED 3-2?</p> <p>15. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise ED 3-5?</p> <p>16. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise ED 3-7?</p> <p>17. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise ED 6-1?</p> <p>18. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise TO 9-1 (b), TO 9-1 (c) and TO 9-1 (d)?</p>	<p>issue.</p> <p>13. The Draft Plan objective sets out a balanced approach to the future development of Whitegate.</p> <p>14. It is intended to revise the text of this objective and insert ‘Normally discouraged’ to bring it into line with text in other parts of Chapter 9.</p> <p>15. It is intended to revise Figure 9-3 Wind Energy Strategy Map” to include all Natura Sites in “Normally Discouraged”.</p> <p>16. It is intended to revise Objective 3-7 “Other Wind Energy Development” in the interests of clarity.</p> <p>17. It is recommended that change is made to text in Para 9.6.2 to deal with this issue.</p> <p>18. Additional text will be added to address the issue of environmental capacity for tourism related</p>	<p>13. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>14. Amendment required.</p> <p>15. Amendment required.</p> <p>16. Amendment required.</p> <p>17. Amendment required.</p> <p>18. Amendment required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p><u>Transport Objectives</u></p> <p>23. TM 1-1 (b) North and West Cork Strategic Plan requires screening and elements are likely to require AA as this is the plan which is the basis for transport plans.</p> <p>24. TM 3-1 (f) re: NRAs policy on services areas and rest areas on motorways requires screening if it is to be supported in the CDP.</p> <p>25. TM 3-2 Belvelly Road. This objective requires full AA.</p> <p><u>Water Services and Waste Objectives</u></p> <p>26. Should objective WS 2-1 (a) of the Draft Plan be amended to reference to environmental legislation rather than regulations and should the towns of Millstreet, Newmarket and Carrigtwohill be included as high priority in part (b) of WS 2-</p>	<p>19. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise TM 1-1(b) to remove reference to the North and West Cork Strategic Plan?</p> <p>20. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise TM 3-1 (f) omitting the word “implementation”?</p> <p>21. Should the Draft Plan be amended to omit reference in Objective TM 3-2 to the R624?</p> <p>22. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise WS 2-1 “Water Infrastructure General”?</p> <p>23. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise WS 6-2 typo?</p> <p>24. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise HE 2-1?</p>	<p>developments.</p> <p>19. It is intended to make reference to the North and West Cork Strategic Plan in the text of the plan and remove the reference in the objective.</p> <p>20. It is intended to revise the wording on this objective to better reflect current NRA policy on Provision of Service areas and rest areas on the motorway network.</p> <p>21. See Point 3 above.</p> <p>22. It is intended to revise this objective to reflect revised approach to water services infrastructure on foot of discussion with DoE, NPWS and Irish Water.</p> <p>23. It is considered that the current word is correct and not a typo.</p> <p>24. It is not considered appropriate to include additional text in the objective;</p>	<p>19. Amendment required.</p> <p>20. Amendment required.</p> <p>21. See Point 3 above.</p> <p>22. Amendment required.</p> <p>23. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>24. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>1? 27. WS 6-2 Typo.</p> <p><u>Heritage Objective</u> 28. HE 2-1 Include additional sub – objective requiring planning applications affecting Natura 2000 sites to submit assessment reports.</p>		<p>the issue raised is dealt with in Paragraph 12.2.1.</p>	
<p>Department of Education and Skills, Forward Planning Section dCDP14/1860</p>	<p>Submission includes detail on the Information used to calculate educational infrastructural requirements and calculates requirements for primary school classrooms and post primary places based on population targets. At Primary Level, expects that the existing schools should be capable of catering for the increase in pupils numbers (may require extensions to existing schools). At post primary level possible to cater by way of expansion to existing schools or new school may be required depending on pupil numbers. The Dept requests site reservations to be made as close as possible to community facilities. Open to</p>	<p>1. Supports the wording included in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to note the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Education & Skills and the City & County Chief Executive's Association on the acquisition of sites for school planning purposes?</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. It is considered that the Draft Plan outlines the requirements for both primary and post primary education as set out by the Department of Education. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Education & Skills and the City & County Chief Executive's Association is noted.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>the concept of multi-campus school arrangements. Ref is made to guidance documents in relation to site suitability for educational provision and the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines which provide that no significant residential development should take place without assessment on the impact of school provision. Ref made to the Code of Practice for the provision of schools and the need for consulting with the Dept re: the assessment of specific sites. Ref made to Memorandum of Understanding between the Dept and the CCMA on the acquisition of sites for school planning purposes. Requests that CCC would take the lead on behalf of the Dept in relation to the identification/acquisition of suitable school sites. States that lands adjacent to existing schools should be where possible protected for possible future educational use to allow for expansion.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Derrycreeha NS dCDP14/1782</p>	<p>This submission raises concerns about the rapid demise of rural communities & facilities stating that we need to ensure that our rural/coastal areas are protected for their natural beauty (as we know our economy benefits from the tourists that travel through our communities) but that they continue to be lively, populated areas with a range of local services that support people living everyday in rural areas including Schools, GAA clubs, local shops and youth groups need to be protected: to ensure this, planning regulations must take into account the housing needs of the local people and support future population growth sympathetically.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended ensure that our rural/coastal areas are protected for their natural beauty and tourism / economic benefits whilst ensuring these areas remain lively, populated and well serviced areas?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>1. The policies in the Draft Plan aim to protect rural and coastal areas in the County while ensuring rural generated housing needs are catered for to support local rural communities.</p> <p>2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Devlin, Brendan dCDP14/1739</p>	<p>This submission notes that the Draft Plan list the Northern Relief as a Key Regional Project for the Council, however it notes that there should be some reference in the Draft to decoupling the Project from the M20 Motorway Scheme as it argues that this would assist in having the project promoted and financed as a stand-alone scheme, rather than being seen as part of the motorway project. The submission notes that this could make it more likely that the project would be constructed in the shorter term rather than in the post 2020 period as is likely if left as part of the M20 Scheme. Finally the submission notes that it is feasible from a design aspect to construct the northern relief road as a separate scheme to the M20 Scheme, while still being compatible with the motorway design.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to decouple the Mallow Northern Relief Route from the M20 Motorway Scheme as this is impeding its progress as a standalone scheme?</p>	<p>It is considered that there is adequate scope within objective TM3-1 to allow for the Mallow Northern Relief Route (N72) to proceed independently of the M22.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Doyle, Richard & McCormack, Pasqueline dCDP14/1758</p>	<p>Deletion from the RPS stating that there is a more appropriate method of protecting this particular structure. Energy efficiency improvements are required on the property to sustain its use as a residential home in the longer term but the restrictions and costs associated with protected structure guidelines deter investment.</p> <p>Properties listed on these RPS lists (of which there is over 1500 listed in this plan) get continually regurgitated on each development plan without any form of review of their actual day to day use, or consultation with owners, as a result many become dilapidated and eventually derelict, as they just become uneconomical to maintain, which is of no value to anybody in the community and eventually they are subject to demolition order on health and safety grounds.</p> <p>Grant system which was in</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete Garryrhu from the RPS?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for a review of the current RPS to ensure that buildings are maintained and given productive uses?</p> <p>3. Finally, the submission notes the Government's introduction of the innovative urban renewal scheme.</p>	<p>1. Objectives in the Draft Plan promote best practice in Architectural Heritage – see section 12.4 Architectural Heritage. This house Garryrhu is on the NIAH and is identified as being of regional importance. The house has architectural merit and its removal from the RPS is not justified. Therefore the building should be retained on the RPS.</p> <p>2. The Council are statutorily required under the Planning Acts to maintain a Record of Protected Structures. Objectives in the Draft Plan promote best practice in dealing with Architectural Heritage, see section 12.4.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>place when the County Council had sufficient funds may have helped some owners, but in the longer term with today's home insulation techniques the architectural heritage is best preserved by making these dwellings liveable, comfortable and energy efficient to allow their continued use as family homes.</p> <p>The Government's introduction of the innovative urban renewal scheme for the refurbishment of city Georgian buildings (1714 – 1830) in Limerick and Waterford in the Finance Bill 2013 but were very disappointed it was not on a nationwide basis.</p>			
<p>Dublin Airport Authority dCDP14/1790</p>	<p>This submission requests that</p> <p>1) Aviation is included under transport and infrastructure heading of the Core Strategy and when the National Aviation Policy is published later this year that it can be reflected in the final adopted Plan.</p> <p>2) It is requested that land use planning is promoted to protect</p>	<p>1) Can the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to include aviation under transport and infrastructure heading and when the National Aviation Policy is published later this year that it can be reflected in the final adopted Plan?</p>	<p>1) Consideration will be given to including aviation under transport and infrastructure heading in the Core Strategy. Depending on the publication date of the National Aviation Policy it may be possible to include reference to this document in the amendments.</p>	<p>1) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>existing operations and to safeguard for the future growth and development of the Airport.</p> <p>3) It requests that sustainable land use planning practices in the vicinity of the airport which take account of the nature of airport operations but which benefit from highly connected nature of the site are promoted.</p>			
<p>Dukelow, Robert dCDP14/1811</p>	<p>Requests permission should be granted more freely for young people in rural areas, which would stop emigration and benefit the local community.</p>	<p>Should the Draft CDP categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Dunmanway Community Council dCDP14/1925</p>	<p>1. Draft CDP gives priority to Cork SPA and Metropolitan Cork SPA giving scant consideration to the sustainability and development of rural areas of the County. 2. Discourage urban generated housing in rural areas. 3. Support indigenous population to live within their rural community. 4. Upgrade of R586 (Bandon – Bantry) to same standard as National Roads. Maintain capacity of County’s road network that its capacity is maintained so that freight transport out of the region is at its most efficient. 5. Lack of commitment in plan to stimulating jobs in the rural areas of the County. 6. Lack of reference to farming and tourism in peripheral areas – what is needed is diversification and alternative farming enterprises. 7. CDP should give priority to existing retail units in town centres; encourage new and</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give due consideration to the Strategic Planning Areas outside of Metropolitan Cork? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to discourage urban generated housing in rural areas? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide for additional categories of Rural Generated Housing Need? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give priority to existing retail units in town centres, encourage new and diverse retail outlets in the town</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the Draft Plan gives due consideration to all of the strategic areas in Cork County in seeking to provide the appropriate balance between rural and more built up or urban areas. However, in terms of infrastructure priority, because the Gateway is located in the Metropolitan SPA, its infrastructure requirements are at a higher priority level as identified in the overall strategy for the county and in accordance with National and Regional Policy as required by the legislation. 2. It is considered that the policies in the Draft Plan are in accordance with the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005, which aim to discourage urban generated housing in rural areas. 3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands” 4. It is not always practical that existing and vacant retail units are appropriate for new development but generally the objectives in the Draft Plan TCR9-1 advocate this approach. TCR2-1</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Rural Coastal and Islands” 4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>diverse retail outlets in the town centre, renewal of vacant sites and building in order to prioritise the regeneration of town centres.</p> <p>8. Discontinuation of requirement of developers to make contribution towards the provision of car parking spaces is welcomed.</p>	<p>centre, renewal of vacant sites and building in order to prioritise the regeneration of town centres?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide more support for the rural economy?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to upgrade the R586 (Bandon – Bantry) to same standard as a National Road in order to retain its capacity for freight transport?</p>	<p>encourages innovation and creativity within town centres.</p> <p>5. Section 6.7 Rural Economy sets out the Councils policy on supporting and promoting rural economic development in agriculture, farm diversification, forestry, fishing and aquaculture.</p> <p>6. Noted. The upgrading of any route to national road status is a function of the National Roads Authority.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Dunmore Golf Club dCDP14/1791</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that it is vital that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area are prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area which has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which has lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs. States that local community organisations/clubs have concerns about their sustainability if young people have to leave the parish. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community? 	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Durrus & District Community Council Ltd dCDP14/1763</p>	<p>This submission makes a number of requests for the village of Durrus in West Cork. Firstly, it requests that a pedestrian access from the village centre to the Community Sports Field located to the South West of the village centre is constructed, it requests the completion of the pedestrian crossing in the village centre from the corner of the Sheep's Head pub to Ryan's shop and notes that as part of the planning requirements for upgrading Ryan's shop, much of the work for the pedestrian crossing has been completed. It notes that the front and back roads from the village centre out towards St. James Church of Ireland are in a poor condition and both would require resurfacing and extension of public lighting as both are popular walking routes. It notes that there is an urgent requirement for a pedestrian footpath and public lighting from the centre of Durrus</p>	<p>1. Can the Draft Plan be amended to address issues specific to Durrus regarding local improvements, pedestrian crossings, public toilets etc?</p> <p>2. Can the Draft Plan be amended to promote the completion of some unfinished housing estates?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that Durrus is identified as a hub centre of the walking in the Sheeps Head Way?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote development and investment in the Wild Atlantic Way?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next Review of the Local Area Plan.</p> <p>2. The Draft Plan and more particularly the Joint Housing Strategy recognises the issue of unfinished housing estates and vacant housing units which are included in the calculations for the Core Strategy housing requirements. At a site specific level, the Council regularly updates the Department of Environment regarding the status of each unfinished estate in the county.</p> <p>3. This is a matter for the next Review of the Local Area Plan.</p> <p>4. Section 8.1.10 recognises the Wild Atlantic Way as a tourism initiative.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Village. It also recognises that there is a need for the provision of public toilets within the village. Notes that there is an unfinished Housing Estate in the village and we would ask Cork County Council to do what they can to ensure that this development is completed before granting planning for future developments. The submission also requests that the Council recognises that if economic and social stability is to be maintained in rural communities, people who live and work locally should not be deprived of living in their native area. It is requested that all the roads in the area are in need of investment.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>EirGrid plc dCDP14/1886</p>	<p>Eirgrid welcomes the support set out in the Draft Plan for the provision and sustainable development of strategic electricity transmission infrastructure. Suggests additional text, policy and objectives.</p> <p>Main recommendations include the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference appendix two in Chapter 9 of plan. 2. Suggested policy for Section 9.6 'Transmission Network'. 3. Extract from the South West Regional Planning Guidelines is included in paragraph 9.6.1. 4. Minor amendment to paragraph two of ED 6-1 and section 9.6.2. 5. Benefit of Grid Link project as recognised in section 3.8.2 of the Environment Report acknowledged. 6. Specifically reference the Grid Link Project and Ireland France Interconnector projects in Section 9.6 and identified in Figure 9-1 with a specific objective in ED 6-1. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include in Section 9.6 Transmission Network. 'The Council endorses supports and promotes the Grid 25 strategy of Eirgrid, the electricity transmission infrastructure provider, in accordance with Government Policy on the Strategic Importance of Transmission and Other Energy Infrastructure'? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the following extract from the South West Regional Planning Guidelines 2010 – 2022 in paragraph 9.6.1 of the Draft Plan as an introduction to the section on the Transmission Network? (Extract. Section 5.6.25 of Regional Planning Guidelines)? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a minor amendment to paragraph 2 of ED 6-1 and a minor amendment to the second bullet point in Section 9.6.2 as outlined? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective ED 6-1 aims to support and facilitate the sustainable development, upgrade and expansion of the electricity transmission grid, storage and distribution network. 2. The Draft Plan is required to implement and support the SWRPG. 3. Objective ED 6-1 and ED 6-2 provides appropriate support for future development of the electricity network. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>7. Welcomes the graphical representation of the transmission network in Figure 9.1 and suggests that the nature, extent and location of Eirgrid’s on-going and future development projects in County Cork (as shown in maps in the Draft Transmission Development plan 2013 and in Fig 1, 1a and 2 and 2a of this submission) are accurately reflected in Figure 9.1 of the Draft Plan. Projects divided into three heading.</p> <p>8. Suggests that it is recognised as ‘the electricity transmission infrastructure provider’ in Section 15.1 and that the energy infrastructure projects outlined in this submission are listed in Table 15.2 and 15.1 as appropriate. Four appendices attached.</p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the Grid Link and Ireland France Interconnector projects are specifically referenced in Section 9.6 of the Draft Plan and identified in Figure 9-1?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional text in Objective ED 6-1 in relation to the final route of any major public utility infrastructure transmission project?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to map the nature and extent and location of Eirgrid’s on-going and future significant development projects that are planned and/ or are in progress in County Cork?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include in Table 15.1 and 15.2 the energy transmission infrastructure required to facilitate the planned economic and population growth, both in</p>	<p>4. It is not considered appropriate to specifically refer to these projects in the Draft Plan until such projects have received the necessary planning consents.</p> <p>5. Objective ED 6-2 and section 9.6.2 provides appropriate support for future development of powerlines.</p> <p>6. It is not considered appropriate to specifically map these projects in the Draft Plan until such projects have received the necessary planning consents.</p> <p>7. Tables 15.1 and 15.2 include critical infrastructure which if not provided may lead to refusal of planning permission for individual projects. It is considered that the energy transmission network would not fall within those terms.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		the Cork 'gateway' area of the County, and elsewhere?		

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Enerco Energy Limited dCDP14/1761</p>	<p>Submission outlines the involvement of Enerco Energy in wind energy in Ireland. It supports the decision to review the wind energy policies and objectives as part of the current Development Plan review and acknowledges both the Energy Background Paper and the up to date policies and objectives in the Draft Plan including the clear mapping of designated areas.</p> <p>General support for approach to wind energy designations, subject to appropriate flexibility in interpretation of boundaries, commensurate with its strategic nature. In identifying 'acceptable in principle', 'open to consideration' and 'normally discouraged' areas for wind energy development, the mapping of these areas should be interpreted in a relatively flexible way, where boundary lines on maps are indicative only and are intended to indicate the general classification of wide areas</p>	<p>1. Should Draft Plan mapping be amended to be flexible and indicative with a general classification rather than specific sites?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that there is no blanket ban of wind developments in open to consideration areas with ecological designations?</p> <p>3. Should that Draft Plan be amended so that there is no presumption against wind development in low wind speed areas?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge the benefits of larger turbines in optimising energy outputs from sites?</p>	<p>1. Detailed mapping of the wind deployment areas set out in the Draft Plan provide certainty on the location of sites suitable for wind energy development or otherwise to perspective developers.</p> <p>2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy".</p> <p>3. It is intended to revise Objective 3-5 and omit reference to unviable wind speed.</p> <p>4. The appropriate size of turbines will depend on the characteristics of each individual site and should be a consideration for Development Management on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>rather than specific sites. There should be no blanket ban of wind developments in open to consideration areas with ecological designations, as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) process will determine acceptability.</p> <p>Similarly, there should be no presumption against wind development in low wind speed areas as viability is not a land use planning matter and is subject to many other factors. The Final Plan should acknowledge the benefits of larger turbines in optimising energy outputs from sites, in the national and global interest and acknowledge that larger turbines will inevitably become more common.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>EPA dCDP14/1852</p>	<p>Draft Development Plan This submission sets out suggested amendments to individual chapters of the plan so that they take the environment more clearly into account. It also makes comments and suggestions relating to the key stages and outputs of the SEA process.</p> <p>1. Section 1.4.4 - <i>Strategic Environmental</i></p>	<p>1. Should Draft Plan be amended to show how the SEA process influenced the plan?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include "Environment" as a key issue in the Core Strategy?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be</p>	<p>1. The SEA process has informed all sections of the plan and it is intended to promote a number of amendments to the Draft Plan on foot of the recommendations of the Environment Report.</p> <p>2. It is intended to include "Environment" in Section 2.1.3.</p> <p>3. The Draft Plan sets out clearly how it</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. Amendment Required.</p> <p>3.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p><i>Assessment</i> further information on the key outcomes of the SEA process, its influence on the Plan and the key recommendations and mitigation measures. 2. Consideration should be given to including '<i>environment</i>' as an additional key issue the Core Strategy. 3. Clarification should be provided on the recommendations and future measures which should be put in place to ensure that future population growth is in line with the requirements of the SWRPG. 4. Why is the population target for South City Environs area is '-1327'. 5. Clarification should be provided regarding the status of the SDZ at Monard. 6. Additional text should be added to</p>	<p>amended to ensure population growth targets comply with RPG?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to explain -1327 population growth in the South Environs?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to explain current status of Monard SDZ?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional text to Objectives CS 4-4 Core Strategy, SC 5-2 Quality provision of Public Open Space, TCR 2-1 Town Centres, TO 4-1(a) Marine Leisure, ED 3-4 Wind Energy, ED 4-1 Hydro, WS 2-1(a) Water Services and GI 13-2 Light Emissions?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to indicate what specific measures are in place to implement Objective CS 5-1: Climate Change Adaptation?</p>	<p>intends to comply with RPG and progress will be monitored to ensure compliance.</p> <p>4. There is significant additional housing units planned for in this area, 1248, however because of the significant existing population base and the level of household formation in the area, the overall population will fall.</p> <p>5. Monard is currently an SDZ as designated by the Minister.</p> <p>6. Consideration will be given to adding additional text relating to the environment to these objectives.</p> <p>7. Regard was had throughout the Plan to climate change issues and it would not be appropriate to list all the areas.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required</p> <p>5.No Amendment Required</p> <p>6.Amendment Required</p> <p>7.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Objective CS 4-4. 7. Consideration should be given to the preparation of a Masterplan for the development of Castletownbere port and developing a Dredging Management Plan. 8. Consideration should be given to outlining the specific measures that will be promoted / put in place to achieve the commitments set out in <i>Objective CS5-1: Climate Change Adaptation</i>. 9. <i>Objective RCI 4-6: Structurally Weaker Rural Areas</i> should be clarified whether this includes one-off housing, holiday homes or multi-unit developments. 10. Plan should ensure that any development in greenbelt areas corresponds with the</p>	<p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include flooding and erosion in the list of key issues facing the coastal zone of Cork?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for the preparation of a Tourism strategy?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a provision that all development must be in accordance with the requirements of the Habitats, Birds, Water Framework, Floods, SEA and EIA Directives?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a summary of existing renewable energy infrastructure and generation capacity and set future targets?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for</p>	<p>8. Additional text will be added.</p> <p>9. It is intended to develop a Tourism and Development Marketing Plan during the lifetime of this plan. There are a number of joint initiatives with other stakeholders currently under way including Cork INC dealing with tourism strategy across the county.</p> <p>10. All development is subject to these provisions under various legislation and it is not considered appropriate to include a specific objective.</p> <p>11. The Draft Plan and energy background document set out the current position with renewable energy. Future developments will be considered on their merits and it would not be appropriate to set specific county targets.</p> <p>12. The wind energy strategy is set within the Draft Plan where it forms an integral</p>	<p>8. Amendment Required</p> <p>9.No Amendment Required</p> <p>10.No Amendment Required</p> <p>11.No Amendment Required</p> <p>12.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>principles of proper planning and sustainable development. 11. Flooding and erosion should be included in the list of key issues facing the coastal zone of Cork, as set out in Section 4.8.4 - <i>Coastal Areas</i>. 12. Amend <i>Objective SC5-2: Quality Provision of Public Open Space</i>. 13. Note that Monard has been included as a principal location in Table 6.1 – <i>Employment Hierarchy</i>. 14. Consideration should be given to referring to the need to restore the East Tip area prior to proceeding with development proposals in Haulbowline. 15. <i>Objective TCR 2-1: Town Centre</i> should be amended to take account of flood risk.</p>	<p>the preparation of a standalone Wind Energy Strategy?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a buffer zone between <i>acceptable in principle</i> and <i>open to consideration areas</i>?</p> <p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision of flood risk/alleviation as key theme in Section 13.2.3?</p>	<p>part of the overall development plan strategy. A standalone strategy would lead to unnecessary duplication and would not be the best use of scarce resources.</p> <p>13. It is intended to modify the Wind Energy Strategy Map and consideration will be given to including additional buffer zones.</p> <p>14. Flood risk/alleviation will be included as a key theme.</p>	<p>13. Amendment Required</p> <p>14. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>16. Consideration should be given to developing a Tourism Strategy or a series of Strategies. 17. <i>Objective TO 4-1 a)</i> should be amended. 18. Include a policy in the Plan to require that all development, where relevant and appropriate, is in accordance with the requirements of the Habitats, Birds, Water Framework, Floods, SEA and EIA Directives. 19. Consider including a summary of the existing renewable energy infrastructure and generation capacity in County Cork, and future targets for the county in Energy chapter. 20. Consider merits of preparing a stand-alone Wind Energy Strategy. 21. <i>Wind Energy Strategy Map</i> to include</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>a suitable buffer zone, or no-go area, between 'acceptable in principle' areas and 'normally discouraged' areas. 22. Objective ED 3-4 and ED 4-1 should be amended. 23. Objective TM 3-2 a) should be amended. 24. Consideration should be given to including a commitment to carry out a feasibility study, to identify and assess potential opportunity logistical development sites throughout the County. 25. <i>Objective WS 2-1 a)</i> should be amended. 26. The GI Strategy should incorporate flood risk/alleviation in addition to the other 'key themes' outlined in Section 13.2.3. 27. <i>Objective GI 13-2: Light Emissions</i> should be</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>amended.</p> <p>Environmental Report This submission makes the following points in relation to the Environmental Report 1. In Chapter 2, the 'other plans and programmes' section, should include references to the National Strategic Aquaculture Plan & National Seafood Operational Programme, the Offshore Renewable Energy Development Plan (DCENR, 2014) and the Lee and South West CFRAMs. The 'legislative context' section should include a reference to the Water Framework Directive, Drinking Water Regulations, Building Energy Regulations, and the Floods Directive. 2. In Chapter 3 Baseline Environment, clarification is needed on how extant planning permissions are monitored in each settlement, particularly where they provide for a scale of development greater than the target adopted for that</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Environmental Report be updated to include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reference to various Plans/ Directives and Regulations. b. Clarification on the role and monitoring of extant permissions. c. More detailed mapping of biodiversity features. d. More detail on the climate change issues facing the county and existing adaptation measures. e. Clarification on the situation with regard to noise mapping. f. The inter linkages between environmental topics. g. Overlay mapping or environmental sensitivity mapping to highlight the most sensitive areas in the county. h. Review the EPOS and amend Target 2 of EPO1. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (a) (b) (d) (e) (f) (h) (i) (k) (l) (m) and (n) the issues will be addressed by way of addendum to the Environmental Report. <p>With regard to items 1(c) and (g) the mapping already prepared is the best the Planning Authority is able to provide at this time.</p> <p>With regard to items (j), the SEMP model relies on using Census data. As Monard does not yet exist as a town, no direct census data is available for it; therefore it was not included in the model. Monard was approved as a Strategic Development Zone by the Minister in 2010 and while the initial planning Scheme was refused by ABP, the Council is working on revised proposals. The Monard SDZ Planning Scheme had its own Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment and it is not a matter for this Draft Development Plan to review these.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare Addendum to the Environmental Report to address these issues raised. <p>No further changes proposed in relation to mapping.</p> <p>No further changes proposed in relation to Monard.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>settlement. Clarification is also needed on whether such permissions have been taken into account in the preparation of the new core strategy.</p> <p>3. In Chapter 3 Baseline Environment, consideration should be given to including additional suitably scaled maps showing biodiversity features etc.</p> <p>4. In Chapter 3 Baseline Environment the key climate change issues for the county should be identified – flooding sustainable transport etc. and existing adaption measures / SUDS features should be described. References should be made to the Lee and South West CFRAMS.</p> <p>5. In Chapter 3 Baseline Environment clarification should be provided on whether noise mapping has been carried out , the inter linkages between environmental topics should be described in further detail and consideration should be given to including relevant overlay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Clarify how SEMPRES has been used to inform the policies of the plan. j. Modelling analysis of Monard and details of the potential environmental effects associated within developing Monard. k. Clarification of how the baseline information described in Chapter 3 has informed the selection and assessment of alternatives. l. Clarification of the meaning of ‘negative’ as used in section 5.7. m. Clarification of how the secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects have been assessed and documented. n. Review of the figures in relation to population and number of housing units required in Section 6.2.1 		

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>mapping or environmental sensitivity mapping to highlight the most sensitive areas in the county.</p> <p>6. In Chapter 4 EPO's consideration should be given to reviewing the EPO's, targets and indicators to ensure that they are linked where relevant and to rewording Target 2 of EPO1.</p> <p>7. In Chapter 5 Alternative Scenarios, it should be clarified how SEMPRES has been used to inform the policies of the plan – have specific problems for specific areas been identified and how will the results of the SEMPRES model be used to inform the policies of the lower level plans? Monard has not been included in the SEMPRES model but it is targeted for development in all alternative scenarios. Modelling analysis of Monard should be included in Table 5.2 and additional information should be provided in relation to the potential environmental effects</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Recommendations for changes to the Draft Plan at the amendment stage need to be subject to SEA Screening. 3. Recommendations from the AA should be reflected in the SEA and the Plan. 4. A list of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring should also be included in the Environmental Report. Consideration should be given to including a commitment to environmental monitoring in the plan and to linking the environmental /SEA related monitoring with the plan implementation review / reporting procedure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Noted. This will be done as part of the addendum to the Environmental Report. 3. Noted. 4. An amendment is proposed to Draft Plan to deal within Monitoring and this will be addressed in the addendum to the Environmental report. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Prepare Addendum to the Environmental Report to address the issues raised. 3. Prepare Addendum to the environmental report to address the issues raised. 4. Prepare Addendum to the Environmental Report to address the issues raised.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>associated within developing Monard.</p> <p>8. In Chapter 5 Alternative Scenarios it should be clarified how the baseline information described in Chapter 3 has informed the selection and assessment of alternatives. In Section 5.7 clarification is required on the meaning of 'negative' i.e. are they negatives which <i>can be adequately mitigated</i> or are they <i>'unlikely to be adequately mitigated'</i>? Adverse effects should be avoided where possible and robust mitigation measures should be put in places where adverse effects cannot be avoided.</p> <p>9. In Chapter 6 Evaluation of the Plan, it is noted that SEA recommendations are to be incorporated into the Plan at amendment stage. The need for these recommendations to be included in the SEA related screening as part of the proposed amendment process should be considered.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>10. In Chapter 6 Evaluation of the Plan, clarification should be provided on how the secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects have been assessed and documented, particularly the potential for cumulative effects in combination with other plans / programmes.</p> <p>11. In Chapter 6 Evaluation of the Plan, consideration should be given to reviewing figures in Section 6.2.1 (70,820 people / 58,003 units required with supply for 73,462 units) in context of the RPGs.</p> <p>12. In Chapter 6 Evaluation of the Plan, recommendations from the AA should be reflected in the SEA and the Plan, and the AA process should be complete before Plan is adopted.</p> <p>13. In Chapter 7 Monitoring, it is noted that final monitoring programme is to be set out in the SEA Statement. A list of the</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>measures envisaged concerning monitoring should also be included in the Environmental Report. Consideration should be given to including a commitment to environmental monitoring in the plan and to linking the environmental / SEA related monitoring with the plan implementation review / reporting procedure.</p>			
<p>ESB dCDP14/1800</p>	<p>Submission states that investment in infrastructure is crucial to economic and social well-being of our country which creates jobs, stimulates economic activity, and provides modern, efficient facilities to provide the services that people need including healthcare, education and community services amongst others.</p> <p>Significant multiplier effect from investment in infrastructure which stimulates growth in the local economy and support EU and national</p>	<p>1. ESB strongly welcomes the targets and development management standards set out in the Plan associated with EV charging infrastructure and parking provision.</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for a car sharing scheme using zero or low emission vehicles as part of transport strategy?</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. It is considered that Para 9.5.3 "Renewable Energy in Transport" and Note 9 in Appendix C Table 1(a) provide good support to encourage electric vehicles and help meet Governments targets.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>policy on Climate Change adaptation and mitigation. Requests consideration be given to matters raised in this submission including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain the planning policies as in Chapter 9 which protects the County’s future capacity for the development of energy generating, processing and transmission infrastructure whilst encouraging the sustainable development of the County’s renewable energy resources. 2. Supports Objectives in Section 9.7 which can facilitate an improvement in telecommunications infrastructure and position the County to attract intellectual and physical capital. 3. The Draft Plan recognises EU and National transportation policy associated with EV charging infrastructure and ESB strongly welcomes the targets and development management standards set out in the Plan. 			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	Request a specific statement for provision of on-street EV charge points be included to ensure the proposed levels of parking provision for EV’s are achieved. Request a car sharing scheme using zero or low emission vehicles be part of transport strategy.			
<p>Estate of Rose McCarthy dCDP14/1875</p>	<p>Submission requests that the subject lands (partly Metropolitan Greenbelt) to the west of the Cork City’s boundary, be included within the development boundary of the Cork City North Environs.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to indicate if the supply of land and population targets identified in the Draft CDP and the respective LAPs are sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>2. The issue of the zoning of specific land is a matter for the review of the relevant Electoral Area Local Area Plan.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Falvey, Tom dCDP14/1870</p>	<p>Submission considers the subject lands to be a 'brownfield site' and states that its inclusion within the greenbelt area is inconsistent with open countryside which characterises much of the greenbelt lands. Therefore, requests the inclusion of the subject lands within the development boundary for South City Environs area. States that simply allocating all A1 lands to the new zoning is not appropriate in all cases and it is disappointing that a full review of the A1 lands does appear to have taken place in advance of the Draft Plan being published.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>1. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Farrell, James dCDP14/1857</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy) within 5km of the scenic routes in areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm/Development and protect potential economic tourist development?</p>	<p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes including areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.			
Farrell, Jimmy dCDP14/1846	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"	No Amendment Required.
Farrell, Mary dCDP14/1848	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"	No Amendment Required.
Farrell, Mary dCDP14/1855	This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to	Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes including areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>energy) within 5km of the scenic routes in areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm/Development and protect potential economic tourist development?</p>	<p>wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Fermoy Enterprise Board dCDP14/1841</p>	<p>This submission sets out the overall general issues for the town of Fermoy and then makes specific reference to the following: (1) Transport & Mobility [10.3.3, TM 3-1, TM 3-1] to include M8 Access/Egress slipways to Fermoy East connecting to N72 Fermoy – Tallow Road. Requests that the provision to provide a third access point to the M8 remain in the CDP and that the NRA to be pursued vigorously to make financial provision to put this third interchange in place. (2) Digital Economy [9.7.7, ED7-2]. There is a need to fast-track the development of high speed broadband connectivity, in the Ring Towns, including Fermoy. (3) Town Centres and Retail [7.4 and 7.9] Ring towns to be supported as retail centres, with retail activity to be promoted in the town core areas, with a cautious approach to out of town retailing. (4) Tourism – 8.7 Walking/Cycling is a key growth area for</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to support for the Healthcare Facilities and Planning for Ageing policies in the draft plan?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to support the Ring towns as retail centres, with retail activity to be promoted in the town core areas?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to fast-track the development of high speed broadband connectivity, in the Ring Towns, including Fermoy?</p> <p>4. Should Draft Plan be amended to provide a third access point to the M8 at Fermoy?</p>	<p>1. Sections 5.6 “Healthcare Facilities” and 5.7 “Planning for Ageing” provide support.</p> <p>2. Objective TCR 4-6 supports the vitality and viability of the Ring and Larger towns and to ensure that such centres provide an appropriate range of retail and non-retail functions to serve the needs of the community and respective catchment areas. Section 7.5.1 states ‘In line with the Retail Planning Guidelines the preferred location for retail development is within town centres and particularly ‘primary areas’.</p> <p>3. Digital Economy - Paragraph 9.7.7 and Objective ED 7-2 aims to ‘Support a programme of improved high speed broadband connectivity throughout the County.</p> <p>4. The zoning map objective U-01 ‘Proposed slip road to bypass’ in the Fermoy EA Local Area Plan 2011 supports the provision of a third access point.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>leisure/recreation in the Fermoy area, and needs to be promoted as such. The Blackwater Viaduct and ancillary connections have huge potential to form part of a Greenway initiative, thereby attracting tourists and leisure users to enjoy the spectacular local scenery. (5) Tourism - Heritage 8.5 notes that the town needs to capitalise on this unique situation and encourage existing shop owners to preserve the unique characteristics of the retail façade of the town. (6) Social & Community 5.6 and 5.7 FEB and Transport & Mobility – Parking 10.4.14 - 10.4.17 FEB supports the provisions of the draft CDP on these issues.</p>	<p>5. Should Draft Plan be amended so that the Blackwater viaduct and ancillary connections form part of a greenway initiative.</p>	<p>5. Consideration will be given to looking at the potential of the Blackwater viaduct and ancillary connections to form part of a greenway initiative in the greenway section in Chapter 8.</p>	<p>5. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Fishbourne, J. dCDP14/1817</p>	<p>Submission relates to the Crosshaven and Bays area and states that the whole area (2 miles inland) from Crosshaven to Fountainstown should be designated an area of conservation and preservation with rigorous planning requirements. This submission expresses concern at the impact of various developments in this area. Wooded areas should be preserved. Guidelines and LAP Development Plans have been ignored in the granting of planning permission. Impact on the landscape of 'skyline' development including housing and wind energy developments. Need for public consultation at pre-planning stage and prior to the zoning of land. Disagrees with U-08 roadway designation and states that new roadways would be extremely visible and would have a regrettable impact on the landscape and environment. PA needs to consult with landowners before</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan High Value Landscape designations be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the impact on the landscape of housing proposals and wind energy developments?</p>	<p>1. The High Value Landscape designations are based on the Draft Landscape Strategy prepared by Cork County Council in 2007, which evaluated each landscape character type in terms of its landscape value, sensitivity and importance. It is not intended to review the current approach to Landscape Character Assessment in the County, until the National Landscape Strategy is published.</p> <p>2. It is considered there is sufficient policy guidance in the Draft Plan relating to the siting of new developments in order to protect the visual and scenic amenities of the County. The assessment of Planning Applications for development proposals is a matter for Development Management.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>making decisions. Roadways in the Fennells Bay area are at capacity. PA needs to make an accurate assessment of all variable, including traffic safety, prior to the granting of permission.</p>			
<p>Fishbourne, Robert dCDP14/1709</p>	<p>This submission requests that the proposed route of the Amenity Walkway U-08 from Crosshaven to Fennells Bay should be re-routed so that it does not traverse or overlook the privacy of the submitter's property. (2). In addition the submission requests that no further coastal land be zoned for development including the expansion of the existing settlement boundary of Crosshaven. (3) Finally, the submission requests that the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to re-route the proposed route of the Amenity Walkway U-08 from Crosshaven to Fennells Bay?</p> <p>2. Can the development boundary of Crosshaven be extended as part of the review of the County Development Plan?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p> <p>2. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>scenic areas and historic structures of Kilcolta Battery and Fort Templebreedy are protected and cannot be demolished.</p>			
<p>Fishers Cross Bowling Club dCDP14/1755</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that it is vital that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area are prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area which has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which has lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs. States those local community organisations /clubs have concerns about their sustainability if young people</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>have to leave the parish. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Fitzgerald, Liam / O'Driscoll, Paul dCDP14/1837</p>	<p>1) The submission requests that the lands currently within the Fermoy Town Greenbelt at the Corrin Interchange are identified as suitable for either Business (Distribution and Warehousing) or Off Line Motorway Service Area.</p> <p>The benefits and logic in zoning the lands are identified and outlined and the submission states that the basis of this rezoning request is primarily related to the provision and availability of Industrial Land provision in the Fermoy area and the two recent An Bord Pleanála Decisions (04.242495 and 04.242586) and directions to Cork County Council in relation to proposed Motorway Service Stations at Junctions 14 and 13 north of this site. This submission focuses on the potential of the site to accommodate an Off Line Motorway Service Station and secondly an Industrial / Warehousing Facility (or</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for the zoning of land for business/off line motorway service area which is currently located in the Fermoy Town Greenbelt?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include consideration of sites at motorway junctions in Objective EE 4-3 "Business Development"?</p>	<p>1) The zoning of additional employment lands in Fermoy is a matter for the next review of the relevant LAP. It is intended to include additional text giving further guidance on the provision of off-line motorway service facilities.</p> <p>2) The location of future employment lands will be considered further in the next LAP Review and the requirements of each town will be assessed on their merits having regard to overall national and local planning policies.</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>possibly both).</p> <p>The submission requests an alteration and addition to the wording of Objective EE 4-3 Business Development of the Draft Development Plan as highlighted in bold in the submission. Appendix A attached contains an access appraisal and a report which demonstrates that the site can be accessed in a manner consistent with established design guidance.</p>			
<p>Fitzgerald, Michael dCDP14/1778</p>	<p>Submission agrees with the proposed rural housing policy changes in the Draft CDP. Requests that the subject lands be rezoned from A1 to A3, if the A1, A2 and A3 zoning is continued in the final Plan.</p>	<p>1. Proposed rural housing policy changes in the Draft CDP should be maintained.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Fitzgerald, Ray dCDP14/1826</p>	<p>Submission states that there is a requirement for new housing in urban Midleton as a result of the increasing population of the Urban Midleton district and as a result of the limited supply of new housing within the last five years. Submission requests that the subject site (within the Metropolitan Greenbelt) be zoned for residential development.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the supply of land and population targets identified in the Draft Plan and the respective LAPs sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period? 2. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”. 2. This is a matter for the next LAP review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”. 2. No Amendment Required.
<p>Forrest Family, Castleview, Blarney dCDP14/1830</p>	<p>Submission supports the retention of Blarney as a key growth location within Metropolitan Cork and requests that reference made in section 3.4.12 to Stoneview is removed in the final Plan. Request that a specific objective be included in the Development Plan for the settlement of Blarney that makes reference to the consideration of new areas in closer proximity to the town with greater potential to be appropriately serviced. Submission states that the subject lands meet this rationale and states the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Core Strategy be modified to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork? 2. Is the supply of land and population targets identified in the Draft CDP and the respective LAPs sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period? 3. Should the Draft CDP Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 3. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the review of the relevant Electoral Area Local Area Plan. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 3. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>potential for development of Stoneview is remote over the period of the new Development Plan. Development of the subject lands will consolidate the development of the town in a co-ordinated and sustainable manner and requests that the subject lands are considered favourably in this context. States the Blarney Masterplan has no prospect of being implemented in the short to medium terms. States that the strategy set out in the Blarney Electoral Area Local Area Plan, 2011 is unlikely to be implemented over the period of the new development plan. The majority of the subject lands are zoned Metropolitan Greenbelt in the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>Hallissey, Joe dCDP14/1718</p>	<p>This submission requests that a well at Rathpeacon should be included on the Record of Protected Structures, setting out its historical local interest. The submission also notes the importance of the drain which takes excess water from the</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the well at Rathpeacon on the RPS?</p>	<p>The well does not appear to have sufficient architectural, artistic, technical, archaeological, cultural, artistic, scientific, social, or historical merit to justify inclusion on the RPS. No amendment is required. The architectural heritage protection guidelines suggest that where an otherwise unremarkable structure has</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	well which it argues should not be land filled.		historical associations, it may be more appropriate to commemorate the association with a wall-mounted plaque. In some cases holy wells can be considered but only where there is sufficient physical fabric for them to be defined as structures and this does not appear to be the case in this instance.	
Halloran, Wayne dCDP14/1783	Submission objects to the zoning of East Cork as a Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence which should instead be changed to the same criteria as Structurally Weaker Rural Area. Submission bases this objection on the following grounds - Environmental Impact, Ecosystems & Human Wellbeing, Population Genetics, Land Devaluation, Irish History, Tourism, Urban Social & Behavioural Problems, Italian Comparison, Sustainable Communities, GAA, Aarhus Convention, Lack of Public Consultation, Irish Constitution, European Law, Anti-Democratic, Education. The submission also includes	Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Area Types Map be amended?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	several questions on the origin of this policy. Submission also includes Appendices – WHO, Ecosystems & Human Well-being Health Synthesis.			
Hanlon Family dCDP14/1707	Submission requests that lands currently zoned Metropolitan Greenbelt in the Draft CDP be rezoned for Industrial / Commercial use. New development boundary for Carrigaline should be extended to the Shannonpark Roundabout to include subject landholding.	1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expand the development boundary of Carrigaline to provide for the zoning of additional land to be for commercial - industrial use?	This is a matter for the next LAP review.	No Amendment Required.
Healy, John W. dCDP14/1722	This submission identifies an area of the Lee Valley to be included in the high value landscape area. It states that the introduction of a road into this area would be repugnant to the legacy of the beautiful Lee Valley.	1. Should the Draft CDP High Value Landscape designations be amended?	1. The High Value Landscape designations are based on the Draft Landscape Strategy prepared by Cork County Council in 2007, which evaluated each landscape character type in terms of its landscape value, sensitivity and importance. It is not intended to review the current approach to Landscape Character Assessment in the County, until the National Landscape	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
			Strategy is published.	
<p>Holland, Tim dCDP14/1776</p>	<p>States that a key challenge for the next CDP will be to provide conditions for economic recovery by prioritising the key infrastructure projects which are required to support development that is consistent with the SWRPG's. States that it is essential that the road infrastructure is already in place to transmit the benefits of recovery along the N71 to Bandon, Clonakilty and Bantry. States that a new bypass to the north of Bandon would help achieve the strategic transportation objectives for West Cork and requests that the CDP be amended to include provision for route selection and preliminary design of a new bridge and northern ring road at Bandon. Submission includes a 'Strategic Review Document'</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for route selection and preliminary design of new bridge and Northern Ring Road at Bandon?</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate in a strategic document to include such a specific provision however objective TM3-2 (Regional and Local Roads) states that the Council will seek funding for the upgrading of a number of Regional and Local Roads in the County and it lists the R586 (Bandon to Bantry) as one of the projects critical to the delivery of planned development.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>relating to a proposal to construct the first stage of a new Bandon North Ring Road. Submission states that there would appear to have been no progress in addressing the requirement for a second bridging point in the town and a proposed study for a bypass of Bandon which were referred to in the 2011 LAP's.</p>			
<p>Horgan, A. dCDP13/1704</p>	<p>Submission requests that the CDP should further develop Buttevant as an upcoming town along the railway line as all the services are there already and it would make much more sense than trying to set up a new town around Monard, Blarney, which is nearly as far from the universities as mallow in real terms of travel etc. (2) It also notes that children that might be living in the newer part of Buttevant could travel by train every day to either Limerick universities or Cork universities</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify if it is still the policy of the Council to develop a new town at Monard or should this growth be distributed to other towns, including Blarney and Buttevant?</p>	<p>1. The development of a new town at Monard is still an important part of the overall planning strategy for the Metropolitan area of Cork, and is supported by the NSS and the SWRPG. The proposed growth at Blarney and Buttevant identified in the Core Strategy of the plan is subject to the provision of critical infrastructure, which is identified in the plan.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>if they wanted and save their parents perhaps a lot of money paying for rental accommodation in Cork or Limerick as they would probably be spending the weekends at home anyway - you would not need anything near the cost to develop the rail station, especially as it was up and running previously.</p>			
<p>Horgan, A. dCDP13/1705</p>	<p>Duplicate of Submission No dCDP14/1704</p>	<p>Duplicate of Submission No dCDP14/1704</p>	<p>Duplicate of Submission No dCDP14/1704</p>	<p>Duplicate of Submission No dCDP14/1704</p>
<p>IBEC dCDP14/1836</p>	<p>The submission notes the past and proposed policies of the draft County Development Plan. It notes that modern waste incineration must be carefully considered in the context of local planning and development and for this reason it requests that it would be helpful to clarify what conditions or circumstances must be satisfied to ensure favourable consideration of a contract incineration activity proposed in an areas designated as</p>	<p>1. Should Objective ZU 3-7 of the Draft Plan be amended to better reflect national waste management policy?</p>	<p>1. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p>	<p>Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>strategic for employment particularly where the activity is in accordance with regional or national policies. The submission also includes reference to IBECs submission to the future Regional Waste Management Plans in January which stressed that spatial planning and application of waste-hierarchy principles by regional and local authorities are hugely important for the development of waste infrastructure and that the new plans must not hinder market-driven technical and economic advances that serve to advance the consideration of waste as a resource.</p>			
<p>IFA (Ardfield/Rathbarr y Branch) dCDP14/1803</p>	<p>States that family members are having difficulty getting planning permission on their own farms and local communities need more young couples living in the area. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft CDP categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft CDP be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.			
IFA (Ballingeary Branch) dCDP14/1794	1. Farming families should get planning permission to build on their own farms. 2. Planning to ensure that rural communities and rural services survive into the future. 3. Rural communities should get support from planning guidelines for rural housing and rural employment policies to ensure a vibrant countryside.	1. Should the Draft CDP categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?	1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".	1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Indaver Ireland Limited dCDP14/1874</p>	<p>This submission seeks clarification regarding the proposed ZU 3-7 zoning objective and requests Cork County Council ensure that the new policies of the Cork County Development Plan are consistent with national law and policy and are sufficiently clear and unambiguous in respect of the range of development permissible. The submission outlines how this can be achieved through amendments to the policy objectives. In addition, it is submitted that policy objective ZU 3-7(c) should be amended so that it is in accordance with national waste policy, as sought by proposed policy objective WS 1-7(a) of the draft plan and amended wording is also put forward in the submission. In addition, while acknowledging that new coastal protection schemes will be necessary in the future to protect coastal areas which are vulnerable to erosion, the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft CDP policies in relation to Coastal Protection be amended?</p> <p>2. Should Objective ZU 3-7 of the Draft Plan be amended to better reflect national waste management policy?</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the policies set out in Para 4.8.18 to 4.8.19 and Objective RCI 8-3 "Coastal Protection" in the Draft Plan address this issue.</p> <p>2. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>appropriate coastal protection measures required in any instance should be carefully assessed to ensure they are economically and environmentally justified, and in this regard further amendments are suggested for section 4.8.19 of the draft Plan, and the removal of policy objective RCI 8-3(b) in the final Plan.</p>			
<p>Inland Fisheries Ireland dCDP14/1708</p>	<p>The Inland Fisheries Ireland is of the view that the Development Plan must recognise that protection of the aquatic environment / habitat not only requires the protection of water quality but also necessitates the protection and maintenance of physical habitat and hydrological process/regimes. The submission states that a development plan should be consistent with River Basin Management Plans and comply</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the protection and maintenance of physical habitat and hydrological process / regimes?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to preclude developments in areas with a deficiency in wastewater infrastructure facilities?</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the policies in Chapter 13, Section 13.10 of the Plan recognise the importance of the protection and maintenance of physical habitat and hydrological process / regimes.</p> <p>2. The current Objective WS 3-1 precludes development in areas where there is a deficiency in wastewater facilities. It is intended to further strengthen WS 3-1 Objective in relation to wastewater disposal.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>with the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). It suggests that it should include policies which preclude developments in areas where the sewage infrastructure facilities necessary for development do not exist. Need for a policy in relation to aquatic heritage protection. Should advocate a change from an acceptance of river corridor interference to an assumption against it and promote the integration and improvement of natural watercourses in urban renewal and development proposals. Address the need for riparian habitat protection and all watercourses, clear policy on river crossing structures, water conservation and river management policies. Reject proposals which would interfere with natural floodplains. Include policies to ensure that developments do not lead to the spread of invasive species. It also encourages local participation</p>	<p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a policy in relation to aquatic heritage protection?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to advocate a change from an acceptance of river corridor interference to an assumption against it and promote the integration and improvement of natural watercourses in urban renewal and development proposals?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the need for riparian habitat protection, clear policy on river crossing structures, water conservation and river management policies?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to reject proposals which would interfere with</p>	<p>3. The plan sets out its policy in relation to Underwater Archaeology in Chapter 12, HE 3-2 and paragraph 12.3.7.</p> <p>4. The Plan does not advocate an acceptance of river corridor interference and includes policy protection for River Channel’s in Chapter 11, WS 5-2 while also recognising the importance of river corridors as a key green Infrastructure asset in Chapter 11.</p> <p>5. The Plan sets out its policies in relation to the protection of Natural Heritage and Biodiversity in Chapter 12, Section 12.2, Water Conservation in Chapter 11, Paragraph 11.4.3 and River Management policies to facilitate the implementation of the WFD and the SWRBD Plan in Chapter 13, Section 13.10. The assessment of proposals for river crossing structures is a matter for Development Management.</p> <p>6. The Plan sets out the Councils approach to avoiding development in areas at risk of in Paragraph 11.6.3,</p>	<p>3. No Amendment Required</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required</p> <p>6.No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>in urban and rural renewal and includes provision for consultation with IFI on developments which may impact on the aquatic environment.</p>	<p>natural floodplains?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft CDP be amended to include policies to ensure that developments do not lead to the spread of invasive species?</p>	<p>Chapter 11. Any proposals for development will be assessed in light of this policy.</p> <p>7. The Plan sets out its policy in relation to the Control of Invasive Species in Chapter 12, Objective HE 2-7. It is not practical or possible to include invasive species strategy in the Plan. It is policy in the County Biodiversity Action Plan to provide guidance and training to LA staff in this area. This is an ongoing area of work for the ecology team.</p>	<p>7. No Amendment Required</p>
<p>IQ Wind Ltd dCDP14/1735</p>	<p>Clarification sought on proposed wind energy policy for the County in relation to the existing permitted 2MW Crocane Wind Farm commissioned in 2011. Existing policy provisions detailed as in the Draft plan. Crocane wind farm (20 year lifetime to 2024, permitted under 02/4699 in 2004, as extended under 08/9780 in 2009) includes a proposal to extend the farm by one further turbine in the future. It is</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove Crocane Wind Farm (permitted and operational) from the 'normally discouraged' area and replace it within an area 'open for consideration'?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and considerations including 'Important or high value landscapes' were acknowledged. Therefore, the coastline east of Cork Harbour should remain within the area where wind farms are "Normally Discouraged"</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>proposed to be located in a ‘normally discouraged area’, where policy ED 3-6 of the Draft Plan applies, as shown in Figure 2 attached. This does not reflect the existing Gate 2 Wind Farm on site, nor does it support the proposed 1 number turbine extension. It is not an auto-producer, as connected to the grid, so the provisions of policy ED 3-7 do not apply. The submission requests removal of Crocane Wind Farm from the ‘normally discouraged’ area and replace it within an area ‘open for consideration’ in accordance with policy ED 3-5 of the Plan, as Crocane Wind Farm permitted and operational, with an existing grid connection, and with a 20 year lifetime to 2024, beyond the lifetime of the draft Plan.</p> <p>It also proposes a revision to the reference to large scale in section 9.3.1.2 of the draft Plan to ‘commercial wind energy developments are those wind energy developments where</p>	<p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise reference to ‘large scale’ in Paragraph 9.3.12 to ‘commercial wind energy developments are those wind energy developments where the primary purpose is to generate electricity for connection to the grid, <u>irrespective of their scale</u>’, and to revise policies ED 3-4, 3-5 and 3-6 accordingly.</p>	<p>2. It is intended to revise the text of Para. 9.3.12 to ensure consistency within the overall on shore wind energy policy.</p>	<p>2. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the primary purpose is to generate electricity for connection to the grid, irrespective of their scale', and to revise policies ED 3-4, 3-5 and 3-6 accordingly.</p>			
<p>Irish Distillers Ltd. dCDP14/1908</p>	<p>Submission states that the CDP should recognise Irish Distillers Ltd contribution to the economic wellbeing of the County and seek to protect and support their future development plans by including appropriate policy support in the CDP. Requests that Paragraphs 6.4.12 and 6.7.5 be amended (as suggested in the submission) and an objective be reinstated in the CDP, supporting the establishment and expansion of industries,</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the Irish Distillers contribution to the economy?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to add additional text to Para 6.4.12 and Para 6.7.5 relating to the relocation of existing industries and to the rural economy.</p>	<p>1. It is not considered appropriate in a strategic document to identify specific industrial users.</p> <p>2. Additional text will be considered to provide further guidance and support where appropriate for industries that may need to relocate to unzoned land.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>which by virtue of their unique characteristics renders them unsuitable to be located in towns / zoned land.</p>			
<p>Irish Georgian Society dCDP14/1759</p>	<p>This submission addresses the following areas:</p> <p>1. Derelict Buildings and Sites: the submission requests that policy RCI 7-4 should be extended to address all derelict or unused buildings deemed to be of architectural interest or contained on the NIAH survey for Cork.</p> <p>2. In addition, the submission requests that policy TCR 2-1 be actively pursued and to adopt all potential mechanisms and initiatives to encourage the re-use and development of derelict site and buildings in towns and villages.</p> <p>3. Record of Protected Structures: The submission</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to extend Objective RCI 7-4 to address all derelict or unused buildings deemed to be of architectural interest or contained on the NIAH survey for Cork?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to actively pursue TCR 2-1 and adopt all potential mechanisms and initiatives to encourage the re-use and development of derelict site and buildings in towns and villages?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a provision to include all those structures on the NIAH which it deems worthy of protection on the RPS within the lifetime of the plan as requested in the Minister of the DAHG?</p>	<p>1. The redevelopment of derelict or disused buildings is considered on case by case basis and is a matter for development management.</p> <p>2. It is the intention of Cork County Council to actively pursue and to adopt all potential mechanisms and initiatives to encourage the re-use and development of derelict site and buildings in towns and villages as outlined in TCR 2-1.</p> <p>3. Cork County Council will continue to work with other interested stakeholders subject to adequate resources available to address Ministerial recommendations.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>notes the position taken in the draft plan regarding RPS and requests that Cork County Council adopt a resolution to address all of the Ministerial recommendations and include all those structures which it deems worthy of protection on the RPS within the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>4. Interim Protection of NIAH Structures: The submission requests that Cork County Council adopt a policy that no building on the NIAH can be demolished or materially altered without appropriate planning permission.</p> <p>5. Buildings at Risk register: Finally, the submission requests that the Council prepare and adopt a buildings at risk register for protected structures and buildings deemed to be of architectural interest by the NIAH and to add all currently unprotected structures on the register prepared by the Irish</p>	<p>Recommendations?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to adopt a policy that no building on the NIAH can be demolished or materially altered without appropriate planning permission?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to require the Council to prepare and adopt a building's at risk register for protected structures and buildings deemed to be of architectural interest by the NIAH and to add all currently unprotected structures on the register prepared by the Irish Georgian Society to the RPS?</p>	<p>4. The Council have provided some recognition and protection to structures on the NIAH in Objective HE 4-2.</p> <p>5. Cork County Council will continue to work with other interested stakeholders subject to adequate resources available to address Ministerial recommendations and make changes or amendments as per national legislation.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	Georgian Society to the RPS as part of the current development plan review.			
Irish Water dCDP14/1881	1) Compliments the Council on the clear presentation format of the plan and accompanying appropriate assessment. 2) Current Investment cycle 2014 to 2016 is largely based on previous WSIP. Next investment programme 2016 to 2021 is	1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise Irish Water’s objective to provide both drinking water and waste water capacity for domestic requirements?	1. The Draft Plan recognises the key role of Irish Water and other infrastructure providers in Chapters 2 “Core Strategy”, Chapter 11 “Water Services and Waste” and Chapter 15 “Putting the Plan into Practice”	1. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>likely to rely on 2011 Census data for population projections. 3) Will provide water services for domestic use in line with statutory development planning, on an incremental basis subject to funding availability and to achieve compliance with relevant discharge licensing consents. 4) Water conservation is a priority. 5) A number of projects included in table 11.1 are currently included in the draft CIP for the period 2014 to 2016. 6) Note that any solution towards improving water quality in the Blackwater river must address all pollutant contributors in order to be effective and successful. Irish Water will work with the Council and other stakeholders to achieve and maintain water quality. 7) Note concerns regarding potential impact of nutrient enrichment in the inner Cork Harbour caused by wastewater discharges. The improvements to the</p>	<p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that water conservation is a priority for Irish Water?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to refer to the Capital Investment Plan?</p>	<p>2. The Draft Plan in Para 11.4.3 to 11.4.5 recognise the importance of water conservation.</p> <p>3. It is intended to include additional text in the Draft Plan dealing with Irish Waters Capital Investment Plan and other longer term strategic plans.</p>	<p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Carrigtwohill WWTP and the building of the Lower Harbour Scheme will improve matters and Irish Water will work with the Council and other stakeholder to further reduce nutrient enrichment and improve water quality.			
<p>Irish Wildlife Trust Cork Branch dCDP14/1781</p>	<p>This submission (1) requests that the plan should state where it is at odds with the definition of sustainable development. (2) It congratulates the council on the preparation of the SEA, Natural Impact Report and the mapped data. (3) It requests that all of the recommendations contained in section 6.17 Vol 3 SEA and Table 3 of the Natura Impact report are implemented. (4) It requests that where higher level plans have placed constraints on the Council meeting objectives on environmental quality that it be addressed and reported. That (5) the assessments of the assimilative capacity of the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to state where it is at odds with the definition of sustainable development?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that all of the recommendations contained in section 6.17 Chapter 6, Volume 3 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Report are implemented in the final version of the Plan?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that all of the recommendations included in Table 3 of the Natura Impact Report are implemented in the final version of the Cork County</p>	<p>1. Sustainable development is a key principle on which the Draft Plan was prepared and every effort has been made to ensure that all development proposals in the plan are sustainable.</p> <p>2. The Draft Plan will be amended to address all of the recommendations contained in Section 6.17 Volume 3 SEA and Table 3 of the Natura Impact Report.</p> <p>3. The Draft Plan will be amended to address all of the recommendations contained in Section 6.17 Volume 3 SEA and Table 3 of the Natura Impact Report.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Blackwater River, Clonakilty Bay and the Cork Harbour Sites should be undertaken in consultation with the Dept of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. (6) It suggests that Chapter 5 is amended to provide greater recognition of the need to protect biodiversity / minimise impacts on sensitive habitats and species. (7) The submission makes a number of detailed recommendations relating to the wording of the following objectives and sections of the draft plan: SC 5-5, ED 4-1, EE 12-2, part of section 8.1.3, ED 4-1, WS 6-2, WS 6-2, HE 2-5, HE 2-7, GI 7-3, ZU 2-3, ZU 3-4 (8) The submission requests that further objectives be included in the plan in relation to Chapter 12 (12.2) Natural Heritage and Biodiversity and chapter 14 to explore the inclusion of a land-use zoning designation. (9) It notes that the Council is required to list and map public rights of way</p>	<p>Development Plan arising from the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2013?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that where higher level plans have placed constraints on Cork County Council meeting objectives on environmental quality, this issue be addressed and reported? See also Recommendation 14 from Environmental Report Volume 3, Chapter 6, 6.17.21, with regard to this issue.</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to have regard to population growth and attendant other development that may result from the Draft Development Plan 2013, that the assessments of the assimilative capacity of Blackwater River, Clonakilty Bay, and Cork Harbour designated sites should be undertaken in consultation with Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht?</p>	<p>4. The Draft Plan must comply with the requirements of the SWRPG. As further higher level plans are adopted in the future, the Plan will be varied where necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B "Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments" Work on Clonakilty Bay is ongoing and amendments will be considered if required.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) B "Population Growth Targets for Sensitive Water Catchments"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>and append them to the Development Plan.</p>	<p>6. Should the plan be amended to provide greater recognition of the need to protect biodiversity / minimise impacts on sensitive habitats and species?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that regard is had to impacts of Objective SC 5-5 as many Open Space zoned lands contain areas of biodiversity interest?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the recommended changes to section EE 4-1, Volume 1, Chapter 6, contained in the Natura Impact Report, Volume 3, Table 3, is expanded to include compliance with Articles 6 and 10 of the Habitats Directive?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the recommended changes to section 6.6.5 Volume 1, Chapter 6, contained in the Natura Impact Report. Volume 3, Table 3, is</p>	<p>6. It is intended to consider including additional text /paragraph in Chapter 2 sections 2.1.3 in order to further recognise the Environment and Biodiversity</p> <p>7. It is intended to cross reference Objective SC 5-5 with HE 2-3, GI 2-1 and GI 3-1 to address this issue.</p> <p>8. The Draft Plan will be amended to address all of the recommendations contained in Section 6.17 Volume 3 SEA and Table 3 of the Natura Impact Report.</p> <p>9. The Draft Plan will be amended to address all of the recommendations contained in Section 6.17 Volume 3 SEA and Table 3 of the Natura Impact Report.</p>	<p>6. Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. Amendment Required.</p> <p>8. Amendment Required.</p> <p>9. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>expanded to include compliance with Article 10 of the Habitats Directive?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to reword Objective EE 12-2, Volume 1, Chapter 6?</p> <p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that section 8.1.3, Volume 1, Chapter 8 is re-worded?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that part of objective ED 4-1, Chapter 9, Volume 1 is amended?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include preparation of a surface water management Plan for the catchment of the Bandon River?</p> <p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that, objective WS 6-2, addresses the impact of proposed development on flood</p>	<p>10. It is considered that Objective EE 12-2 already addresses the issues of sustainability.</p> <p>11. It is considered that the existing text address the issue of sustainable tourism.</p> <p>12. It is considered that the existing wording addresses the issue raised.</p> <p>13. It is not intended to include a requirement for the preparation of the Surface water management plan for the Bandon River. This issue was not raised by any of the Statutory Agencies with responsibility in this area.</p> <p>14. It is intended to consider amending WS6-2 to ensure that the impact of any development within flood plains of</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. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>plains upstream and downstream of Natura 2000 sites, and their qualifying species where they occur upstream and downstream of the Natura 2000 site?</p> <p>15. Should the Draft Plan be amended in relation to HE 1-1, to remove the phrase 'subject to the availability of funding'?</p> <p>16. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that in relation to HE 2-5, a further point e) be added to the effect that trees listed in the Tree Council's Heritage County list for Cork be afforded the same level of protection as those subject to Tree Preservation Orders?</p> <p>17. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that Objective GI 7-3 b) be re-worded to read 'Stipulate appropriate landscaping and screen planting, using native plant species sourced from native stock and appropriate to the site, of developments along scenic routes'?</p>	<p>Natura 2000 sites is fully assessed.</p> <p>15. It is intended to remove the phrase 'subject to the availability of funding'</p> <p>16. Cannot give statutory protection to trees on Tree Council List unless they go through TPO process. Such trees are covered by general trees and woodland protection policy HE 2-5.</p> <p>17. It is considered that landscaping of individual sites is a matter for Development Management and that Objective GI 6-1 and 7-3 provide adequate support.</p>	<p>15. Amendment Required.</p> <p>16. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>17. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>18. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that Objective ZU 2-3 and ZU 3-4 Volume 1, Chapter 14 be re-worded to take account of compliance with Article 10 of the Habitats Directive?</p> <p>19. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that an objective is included in Chapter 14 to explore the inclusion of a Land-Use Zoning Designation for Areas of County Biodiversity / Conservation Interest, in addition to designated areas?</p> <p>20. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a list and map of public rights of way?</p> <p>21. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that zoning</p>	<p>18. It is intended to delete ZU 2-3 and amend objective HOU 5-1. Consideration will be given to amending the wording of ZU 3-4 to take account of compliance with Article 10 of the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>19. Further work in relation to the County Habitats Mapping Project and the GI Infrastructure to generate sufficient data to identify any such areas.</p> <p>20. The Plan sets out that the Council will, where requested, give consideration to the inclusion of rights of way in the CDP, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Act.</p>	<p>18. Amendment required.</p> <p>19. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>20. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>designations for Areas of County Biodiversity interest is included in plan?</p> <p>22. Should the Draft Plan be amended due to observed instances of public rights of way on land zoned as public Open Space that contains habitats of conservation interest being restricted by owners of adjacent private land?</p> <p>23. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide for an invasive species strategy under HE 2-7?</p>	<p>21. Further work in relation to the County Habitats Mapping Project and the GI Infrastructure to generate sufficient data to identify any such areas.</p> <p>22. The Plan sets out that the Council will, where requested, give consideration to the inclusion of rights of way in the CDP, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Act.</p> <p>23. It is not practical or possible to include invasive species strategy in CDP. It is policy in the County Biodiversity Action Plan to provide guidance and training to Local Authority staff in this area. This is an ongoing area of work for the ecology team.</p>	<p>21. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>22. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>23. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Irish Wind Energy Association dCDP14/1796</p>	<p>IWEA states that the proposed changes to the draft Plan will severely restrict the development of wind energy in the County and will impact the delivery of Ireland’s renewable energy targets. Restrictions in relation to Natura 2000 sites and NHA’s will significantly restrict the potential for wind energy development. IWEA strongly recommends that there should be no blanket prohibition of development in Natura 2000 sites and considers the exclusion of these areas contrary to specific EU Commission advice on implementation of Natura 2000 regulations. Requests that restrictions and buffers are removed, allowing detailed scientific assessments in relation to any potential project, to govern the suitability or otherwise of individual sites identified for development (subject to the findings of the EIS and AA). Reference to Section 9.3.14 Open to</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that there should be no blanket prohibition of development in Natura 2000 sites and considers the exclusion of these areas contrary to specific EU Commission advice on implementation of Natura 2000 regulations?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that reference to Section 9.3.14 Open to Consideration and Objective ED 3-5 to address the inappropriateness of arbitrarily ruling out areas of lower wind speeds is amended?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to retain the designation of Open to Consideration for areas within the North-West and North of the County?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” The Draft Plan does not propose a blanket prohibition on wind energy developments in Natura 2000 sites however it does indicate that within these areas the standards are set much higher given their environmental sensitivities and the fact that other alternative more suitable less environmentally sensitive sites are available.</p> <p>2. It is intended to revise the text of ED 3-5 to omit reference to unviable wind speed.</p> <p>3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” The Wind Energy Strategy Map is based on consideration of a number of criteria and key policy considerations including wind speeds and the need to protect Natura 2000/nature conservation sites, high value landscape, urban areas and the areas considered suitable/unsuitable in adjoining counties.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Consideration and Objective ED 3-5 the inappropriateness of arbitrarily ruling out areas of lower wind speeds. It is not correct to generally state that large scale wind energy development would be marginal in North East Cork. Advances in turbine technology increase the efficiency of Wind energy projects and their commercial viability. Concerns that the draft CDP is proposing a change of some of the areas designated Open to Consideration to 'Normally Discouraged'. The placing of an apparent and arbitrary 250m buffer around the SPA and designating as Normally Discouraged will have a serious knock-on effect for development in any SPA.</p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove the arbitrary 250m buffer around the SPA and designating as Normally Discouraged?</p>	<p>Therefore, North East and North West Cork were excluded for a number of reasons.</p> <p>4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" The Draft Plan does not propose a blanket prohibition on wind energy developments in Natura 2000 sites however it does indicate that within these areas the standards are set much higher given their environmental sensitivities and the fact that other alternative more suitable less environmentally sensitive sites are available.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Irish Wind Energy Association dCDP14/1797</p>	<p>Duplicate summary of submission dCDP14/1796 from IWEA (without attachment).</p>	<p>Duplicate of dCDP14/1796 from IWEA (without attachment).</p>	<p>Duplicate of dCDP14/1796 from IWEA (without attachment).</p>	<p>Duplicate of dCDP14/1796 from IWEA.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>JR Oronco dCDP14/1911</p>	<p>Submission requests that the CDP revises the Motorway Service Area provisions to ensure the plan is supportive of the development of an 'off-line' service station at Junction 14 Fermoy. Requests the CDP (a) Provides a co-ordinated approach to the provision of off-line motorway service areas in line with the 2012 Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines, (b) Acknowledges the requirement for an MSA facility on this part of the M8 and state that the requirement can be met by an on-line or off-line MSA, (c) Clearly state that a proliferation of private off-line service area facilities at National Rd junctions shall be avoided and (d) Recognise that an on-line MSA is 'Strategic and Exceptional in Nature' to comply with Greenbelt policy. (e) States that the only possibility of an MSA on this part of the M8 is at Junction 14, given the significant additional refusal reason which rules out</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Motorway Service Area provisions to ensure the plan is supportive of the development of an 'off-line' service station at Junction 14 Fermoy?</p>	<p>It is intended that additional text will be added to Objective T-1(f) to clarify the Council's position and update the current policy in line with recent NRA Guidelines.</p>	<p>Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>any possibility of an MSA at junction 13. Submission seeks to add text to section 10.5 of the CDP and amend Objective TM 3-1(f).</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Keep Ireland Open dCDP14/1862</p>	<p>This submission from Keep Ireland Open states that the Draft CDP fails to comply with, have regard to or takes into account the Planning & Development Acts, NSS, adjoining CDP's or DoECLG Guidelines. Suggests that there are some excellent provisions in the 2009 Plan which should be included. States that the main chapters/sections should include sub-sections and an Index should be provided. The submission includes comprehensive proposals for additional text and changes to the following Draft CDP Chapter's – C1. Introduction, C4. Rural, Coastal and Islands, C6. Economy and Employment, C8. Tourism, C9. Energy and Digital Economy, C10. Transport and Mobility, C12. Heritage, C13. Green Infrastructure and Environment and C15. Putting the Plan into Practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a list of the mandatory requirements to be included in a development plan? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to be consistent with the NSS and RPG? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to list relevant Government Guidelines? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to list the neighbouring counties and has the plan taken sufficient account of the provisions in adjoining counties? 5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to mention the 2 year review? 6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to support, promote and preserve public access to islands and to protect landscape character, heritage, archaeology and natural heritage from 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not intended to restate the mandatory requirements of the development plan as they are set out in the legislation. 2. Both the SWRA and Department of the Environment have indicated that the plan is consistent with the NSS and RPG. 3. The relevant Guidelines are outlined in Appendix F of the plan. 4. The plan has both in its development of policy (especially in relation to cumulative impacts) and in the preparation of the SEA Environmental Report, taken account of the provisions in adjoining counties. 5. The plan refers to the 2 year review in section 15.4 Monitoring the Implementation of this Plan. 6. It is considered that Policy RCI 9-4 is sufficient to preserve access to the Islands. Detailed policy relating to the protection of Landscape, Heritage including Natural heritage is outlined in Chapter's 12 and 13. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required. 4. No Amendment Required. 5. No Amendment Required. 6. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>inappropriate development?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a list and map of public rights of way?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include objectives regarding enforcement proceedings under the Planning and Development Acts?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include reinforcing and additional points and objectives in relation to cycling and implementation of national cycle policy documents?</p> <p>10. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expand policies relating to the Chapter 9 Energy and Digital Economy in particular Hydro power, Telecommunications Infrastructure and Satellite Dishes?</p>	<p>7. The Plan sets out that the Council will, where requested, give consideration to the inclusion of rights of way in the CDP, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Act.</p> <p>8. It is not intended to include objectives regarding the enforcement proceedings as these are clearly set out in the legislation and it is not a requirement of the development plan.</p> <p>9. It is considered that cycling has been adequately addressed within Section 10.2 of the Transport and Mobility Chapter of the Plan.</p> <p>10. It is considered that the policies set out in the Draft Plan relating to these areas adequately covers planning policy issues.</p>	<p>7. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>9. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>10. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>11. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expand policies relating to Heritage Chapter 12 in particular to Biodiversity, Wetlands, Geological Sites, Historical Heritage, Width of Riparian Corridors, Coastal Heritage, and Inland Waterways?</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expand policies relating to walking and cycling in Chapter 8 Tourism?</p> <p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expand policies relating to Green Infrastructure?</p>	<p>11. It is considered that the objectives in Chapter 12 Heritage adequately address the concerns outlined.</p> <p>12. It is considered that the objectives in Chapter 8 Tourism & Section 10.2 of the Transport and Mobility Chapter adequately address policies relating to walking and cycling.</p> <p>13. It is considered that Section 13.4 Countryside Recreation and Section 13.5 Landscape in Chapter 13: Green Infrastructure and Environment adequately address concerns in relation to Landscape and Countryside Recreation.</p>	<p>11. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>12. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>13. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Kelleher, Cllr John dCDP14/1706</p>	<p>This submission requests that the proposed new town at Monard should be abandoned as it argues that it is hard to justify on financial grounds. Submission notes that if further population growth is required that there are brownfield sites in the city and other locations near existing rail and other services that would be more suitable for development. Finally the submission notes that more investment should be put into the city to encourage more people into live there and reduce the vacancy rates in the city centre.</p>	<p>Is it still the policy of the Council to develop a new town at Monard or should this growth be distributed to other locations including Cork City?</p>	<p>1. The overall growth for Cork City and County is set out in the SWRPG, and to reallocate the growth for Monard to Cork City would not be in accordance with that strategy. The development of a new town at Monard is still an important part of the overall planning strategy for the County Metropolitan area of Cork, and is supported by the NSS and the SWRPG. The draft development plan is supportive of Cork City's role as the primary location for retail development.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Kenneally, John dCDP14/1923</p>	<p>This submission requests that No. 11 Greenane, Kanturk, RPS no 01208 be taken off the record of protected structures.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete No 11 Greenane Cottages from the RPS?</p>	<p>The house forms part of an attractive terrace and both numbers 11 and 12 are on the RPS. No 11, which is the subject of this submission also falls into an ACA. The house should remain on the RPS.</p>	<p>No amendment is required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Kinsale History Society dCDP14/1883</p>	<p>This submission requests the Preservation of the Battle of Kinsale, 1601 site by providing for a full survey of the area to identify sites that can be developed and sites that should be preserved.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended so that account is taken of the Preservation of the Battle of Kinsale, 1601 site by providing for a full survey of the area to identify sites that can be developed and sites that should be preserved?</p>	<p>Chapter 12 Heritage includes a section - Battlefield and Siege Sites (section 12.3.13) which acknowledges the significance of battlefields and indicates that consideration will be given to the conservation and protection of the significant battlefield sites in County Cork.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Knockraha Area Historical and Heritage Society dCDP14/1769</p>	<p>This submission requests that 'Protected Structure Status' be given to the buildings at 'Sing Sing Prison' Kilquane, 'The Bomb Factory' Ballynanelagh and 'Liberty Hall', Ballinbrittig Cross, Killacloyne, and provides a significant level of detail on each structure, together with an overall map showing the areas of historical significance at Knockraha and Hinterland.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the structures, 'Sing Sing Prison' Kilquane, 'The Bomb Factory' Ballynanelagh and 'Liberty Hall', Ballinbrittig Cross, Killacloyne, at Knockraha and Hinterland on the RPS?</p>	<p>There is merit in including the Sing Sing prison and Liberty Hall structures on historical / cultural interest grounds.</p> <p>The exact condition of the bomb factory has not been determined. The information on the Bomb Factory is inconclusive. (There are commemorative plaques on both Liberty Hall and Sing Sing prison)</p>	<p>Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Leahy, Teresa dCDP14/1789</p>	<p>This submission objects to the potential development of commercial scale wind farming in the East Cork area which is an area of natural beauty with a thriving tourism area and a huge population. The submission states that this type of development in East Cork will have a detrimental effect on the area.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to exclude development of large scale wind farming in the East Cork area which is an area of natural beauty with a thriving tourism area and a huge population?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>In designating East Cork as Open to Consideration or Normally Discouraged a number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map including 'Important or high value landscapes' and Natura 2000 sites. Therefore, the coastline east of Cork Harbour should remain within the area where large scale wind farms are "Normally Discouraged".</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Lehane, Cait dCDP13/1703</p>	<p>Coolkellure House, Dunmanway, should be included in the RPS list.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Coolkellure on the RPS?</p>	<p>Coolkellure House is a Victorian house of considerable architectural, historical and artistic merit. There is also an adjacent and associated church and lodge which also have significant merit. All are on the NIAH and are identified as being of regional importance. It is intended to include Coolkellure House, associated church and lodge on the RPS.</p>	<p>Amendments required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Lehane, Con dCDP14/1820</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes including areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy) within 5km of the scenic routes in areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm/Development and protect potential economic tourist development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
Lehane, Con dCDP14/1840	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy". A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.	No Amendment Required.
Lehane, Eoghan dCDP14/1713	Submission objects to the inclusion of the Fastnet Lighthouse in the Draft RPS. States that it is not appropriate that any legal restriction should be placed on the operation and management of this structure which might inhibit CIL in the performance of their statutory duties.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete the proposed RPS Fastnet Lighthouse?	Fastnet Lighthouse is identified as a structure of national importance on the NIAH. Objectives in the draft plan promote best practice in architectural heritage -see section 12.4. Deletion in this case is not justified.	No Amendment Required.
Lehane, Jerry dCDP14/1843	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy". A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		Discouraged'?	Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.	
<p>Lehane, Jerry dCDP14/1859</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes including areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy) within 5km of the scenic routes in areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm/Development and protect potential economic tourist development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy".</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Lidl dCDP14/1866</p>	<p>The purpose of this submission is to provide comments on the key issues associated with retail planning policies and objectives contained within the Amendments to the Draft Cork Metropolitan Joint Retail Strategy 2013, and to provide the appropriate policy context to facilitate the existing and expanding network of stores in Cork City and County. The submission sets out the following key issues: (1) describing “Appropriately Scaled Convenience Offer” - to ensure that the planning system continues to play a key role in supporting competitiveness in the retail sector for the benefit of the consumer. (2) Detailing criteria/characteristics/ definition of a "significant retail development". (3) Additional criteria proposed to that contained in the Retail Planning Guidelines (2012), (4) Limiting</p>	<p>This submission primarily relates to the Joint Retail Strategy and corresponding study. This submission is similar in nature to submission 1864 of Lidl Ireland GmbH and has been assessed as such.</p>	<p>See response to submission dCDP14/1864.</p>	<p>See response to submission dCDP14/1864.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Comparison retail in Neighbourhood Centres should facilitate Convenience Retail. (5) It is also noted that competition and choice is a central pillar of national retail planning policy and it is requested that Cork County Council will give the requisite weighting to the issue accordingly.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Lidl Ireland GmbH dCDP14/1864</p>	<p>This submission outlines a number of areas concerning retail development, (1) Argues that competition and choice is a central pillar of national retail planning policy that the Council will give weighting to this issue, (2) Argues that the draft plan is potentially restricting innovation or competition in the retail sector by using words like "typically" in defining the characteristics of the Retail Hierarchy and (3) That the Planning Authority should encourage not restrict diversity, variety, vitality and viability.(4) Requests that multiple food stores should be encouraged within Retail Centres. (5) That retail development is considered an Important Employment Concept and that the CDP should acknowledge the role of this Sector by promoting Retail Development. (6) In Cork it is noted that some areas close to centres of population are not providing the necessary level of</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to confirm that retail impact assessments are not required within existing town centres or district centres?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a requirement for considering the extent and nature of existing vacant floorspace, and its suitability for the type and scale of retail facility proposed is only relevant where the comparison mix of retail development is in excess of 30%?</p> <p>3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that discount retailers are different and add to the vitality and variety</p>	<p>1) It is not considered appropriate to exclude the need for a RIA or sequential test assessment for all town centre or district centre zoned lands. Retail proposals require to be assessed on the impact of the proposal on core retail areas as well as the impact of the proposal on adjoining town centres. In this regard, it is considered appropriate that the requirement for a retail impact or sequential test assessment be determined to the satisfaction of the planning authority.</p> <p>2) It is considered appropriate that an assessment of existing vacant floorspace is appropriate in towns where particularly high vacancy rates exist.</p> <p>3) The 2012 Retail Planning Guidelines no longer distinguish between main stream convenience retailers and discount foodstores. The Draft Plan and Retail</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required</p> <p>2) No Amendment Required</p> <p>3) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>penetration and development of Discount Foodstores in these locations is to be encouraged. (7) That the key retail tests, should be demonstrated only where necessary and that the requirement for Retail Impact Assessment as presented within the draft CDP is contrary to the Retail Planning Guidelines (2012). (8) The requirement for considering the extent and nature of existing vacant floorspace, and its suitability for the type and scale of retail facility proposed, should only be relevant where the comparison mix of retail development is in excess of 30%. (9) Requests clarification on the development of 'Town Teams'.</p>	<p>of the area?</p> <p>4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional statements which promote retail development as an important employment concept?</p>	<p>Study have been prepared in light of the guidance set out within the Retail Planning Guidelines and in this regard it is not considered appropriate to distinguish between different formats of convenience retailers.</p> <p>4) The Draft Plan recognises that the retail sector is a key element of the national economy in terms of employment and economic activity and policies and objectives in relation to retail and town centres are specifically set out in an individual chapter of the plan.</p>	<p>4) No Amendment Required</p>
<p>Linehan, Edmond dCDP14/1876</p>	<p>Submission requests that all or part of the subject lands (Predominantly Metropolitan Greenbelt) are zoned for low density development. Submitter has family members (including submitter) who have housing needs and would like to</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>1. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the review of the relevant Electoral Area Local Area Plan.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	live locally.			
Linehan, Edmond dCDP14/1877	Duplicate of dCDP14/1876	Duplicate of dCDP14/1876	Duplicate of dCDP14/1876	Duplicate of dCDP14/1876
Loftus, Donncha dCDP14/1907	Submission requests that CDP accurately reflects the Convenience Floorspace Distribution figures contained in the Draft Retail Strategy. Requests that the CDP recognises the need for a new Neighbourhood Centre to serve the development of a new residential community on X-01 lands. Requests that the CDP indicates that the new Neighbourhood Centre will be upgraded to a District Centre, if the proposed upgrade of the existing Fox & Hounds Neighbourhood Centre to District Centre proves to be not feasible. Requests that the principles of the co-ordinated approach to be undertaken by the County Council and City Council relating to the retail requirements of Ballyvolane, be	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to support designation of a neighbourhood centre at Ballyvolane whilst allowing for future potential as a District Centre if issues in relation to the development of site T-01 in prove insurmountable?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide clarity in relation to Table 7.2?</p>	<p>1) Given their relative small scale it is not considered appropriate to identify individual neighbourhood centres in this strategic document. Table 7.1 states that the opportunity for development of new neighbourhood or local centres will be identified in Development Plans or Local Area Plans as appropriate. The relative merits of the site as future District Centre can also be identified as part of the next LAP review process.</p> <p>2) It is proposed to revise table 7.2 to provide greater clarity.</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required</p> <p>2) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	outlined in the CDP. Requests that Table 7.2 and Section 7.7.3 of the Draft CDP be amended as suggested.			
Lucey, John dCDP14/1902	This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy". A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Lucey, John dCDP14/1905</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”.</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Lucey, Phil dCDP14/1900</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”.</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>		<p>objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	
<p>Lucey, Phil dCDP14/1903</p>	<p>This submission refers to the Energy Background Paper, November 2010, Page 25 and requests that all turbines in County Cork proposed by a Wind Energy Farm / Development Company (Excluding 'National Planning Exempt turbines'), shall be set back (restricted zone) from any occupied dwelling by the following ratios: turbine height less than 50 metres=750 metres setback; turbine height 50 to 100 metres=1000 metres setback; turbine height 100 to 150 metres=1250 metres setback; etc. The submission proposes that</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for different separation distances from any occupied dwelling depending on size and scale of wind turbine? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for a resident veto on planning permission for wind farm developments?</p>	<p>1. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration. 2. This proposal would require a change in planning legislation which is a matter for the national legislature.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the residents within this restricted setback zone shall exercise a veto on planning permission being granted to proposed Wind Energy Farm/Development unless and until agreement can be reached between resident in occupied dwelling and the proposed Wind Energy Farm / Development Company.</p>			
<p>Lucey, Phil dCDP14/1904</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy".</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Maher, Tommy dCDP14/1914</p>	<p>Submission requests that the subject lands at Glounthane be removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt and instead included within the development boundary of the village.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>1. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the next review of the relevant Local Area Plan.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Mallow CHP dCDP14/1901</p>	<p>The benefits of the project under development for a small scale Biomass Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility at Mallow powered by biomass are outlined.</p> <p>The existing zoning on this site at Gooldhill, as defined in the Mallow Special Local Area Plan is for Industry/Enterprise and the submission proposes that the zoning remain unchanged, as the site in question is suitable for the purpose and has significant potential.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposed site of the CHP facility is located within an area that is designated as one of "High Landscape Value", arising from Section 13.6 of the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to outline the benefits of a small scale Biomass Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility at Mallow?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the delineation of the 'High Value Landscape' have regard to zoning boundaries and lands that are zoned for development be excluded from them?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the high value landscape designation is altered to allow for the industrial development to take place on lands already designated for this purpose?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan is a strategic document and gives broad support to Bioenergy developments including Biomass. Local Initiatives could be recognised in the next LAP review.</p> <p>2 and 3. The intention of the plan is not to preclude development in High Value Landscapes, but to ensure that considerable care is required in order to successfully locate large scale developments in High Value Landscapes without them becoming unduly obtrusive.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Application of this landscape designation has not had regard to town development boundaries and to land use zonings. In the case of this site, it overlaps with an industrial land use zoning. It is suggested that the simultaneous designation of such lands for industry and also as a protected landscape of high value is an inherent contradiction in the development plan. Mallow CHP respectfully suggests that the delineation of the 'High Value Landscape' at this location, indeed at all locations within the county, should have regard to zoning boundaries and that lands that are zoned for development should be excluded from them.</p> <p>It is recommended that the high value landscape designation be altered, as per figure 5 and 6 in this submission, to allow for the industrial development to take place on lands already designated for this purpose.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Mallow Development Partnership dCDP14/1838</p>	<p>The submission relates to a significant number of items in the Plan: (1)the effect the NSS which designated Mallow as a hub, has had on the town, noting that the town has lost out on national and EU funding. (2) The flight of jobs and opportunities from the agri/food businesses and industries that have traditionally represented the economic backbone to the town and region. (3) It notes the implications for traffic management in the absence of the N20 and Northern Relief Road projects, especially since the rejuvenation project on Main Street. (4) It notes that the Blackwater Valley is deserving of special recognition as a potential driver of economic, educational and community uses and link better to broader regional tourism marketing activities. (5) It suggests that the plan must optimise initiatives in education and innovation and outline how</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to influence the effect the NSS which designated Mallow as a hub, has had on the town.</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the significant job losses in traditional areas like agri/food businesses and industries?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the implications for traffic management in the absence of the N20 and Northern Relief Road projects, especially since the rejuvenation project on Main Street?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give special recognition to the Blackwater Valley and Mallow Castle as a potential driver of economic,</p>	<p>1. The Plan must be consistent with the NSS and SW Regional Planning Guidelines, and therefore the designation of Mallow as a 'Hub' must be included in the plan. The implications that this has had on the funding provisions for the town is noted. It may be necessary to vary the Plan when the review of the NSS is completed.</p> <p>2. The Draft Plan provides a strategic framework for the provision of employment lands and will identify the infrastructure needed to make these lands available.</p> <p>3. The Draft Plan will set out the key infrastructure required for Mallow to ensure that its plays its part in achieving the Plan targets. Specific local issues will be dealt with in the next LAP review.</p> <p>4. The importance of the Blackwater Valley is recognised as a key tourism asset and Mallow Castle is recognised as a key tourist attraction in Chapter 8 Tourism.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the Council can support existing and planned initiatives for Mallow and how it can support the scaling up these within the proposed new regional administrative identities, outlining a number of projects currently underway (The Mallow Schools Project) and with CIT. (6) Vacancy and dereliction remain significant inhibitions on Mallow retail to thrive and need to be addressed in a coherent, time-lined plan. (7) The plan should outline Mallow's built heritage and draw up design principles ensuring that new development is effectively managed. (8) The need for an integrated community and sports facility in the south side of the town was noted.</p>	<p>tourism, social and community development?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to optimise initiatives in education and innovation?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the concerns about vacancy and dereliction in Mallow Town and the impact on future retail development?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify a site for an integrated community and sports facility in the south side of the town?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to take a strategic view of road infrastructure in Mallow to include the importance of the proposed Ring Road?</p>	<p>5. A clear policy framework for the provision of social, community and health facilities is set out in the Draft Plan. Specific local issues will be dealt with in the next LAP review.</p> <p>6. The specific needs of individual towns will be addressed in the next LAP Review. The Draft Plan in Chapter 7 "Town Centres and Retail" sets out a suite of policies dealing with the rejuvenation of town centres, tackling such issues as vacancy and dereliction to make Town Centres more attractive.</p> <p>7. The identification of a specific site for such uses in Mallow will be dealt with in the next LAP review.</p> <p>8. Objective TM3-1 (National Road Network) Chapter 10 states Council will seek the support of the NRA for key national and regional projects which include Mallow i.e. the M20 and N72.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>8. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Maloney, George dCDP14/1766</p>	<p>This detailed submission concerns the Clonakilty Technology Park making the following requests. 1) Firstly to acknowledge and further strengthen the importance of Clonakilty as a Regional Integrated Employment Centre and also to acknowledge the contribution the West Cork Business and Technology Park makes to this employment role and confirm that it forms part of the Clonakilty Integrated Employment Centre. 2) Regarding LAP 6-1 of the current 2009 CDP it is requested that the following objective is reinstated: 'to prepare a greater Clonakilty Area Strategic Plan (GCASP) to set out the broad strategic vision for Clonakilty Town and its hinterland up to 2030 emphasising its key development role for the West Cork Strategic Planning Area and shall be subject to screening for SEA and HDA. 3)The submission also requests</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge and further strengthen the importance of Clonakilty as a Regional Integrated Employment Centre and also to acknowledge the contribution the West Cork Business and Technology Park makes to this employment role and confirm that it forms part of the Clonakilty Integrated Employment Centre?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include an intention to prepare a greater Clonakilty Area Strategic Plan (GCASP) to set out the broad strategic vision for Clonakilty Town and its hinterland up to 2030?</p> <p>3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify the West Cork Business and Technology Park as a Strategic Employment Area in Policy EE 4-1?</p>	<p>1) It is intended to consider amending Table 6.1 "Employment Hierarchy" to recognise the role of Clonakilty as an important employment centre.</p> <p>2) The preparation of a GCASP is no longer considered appropriate as the formation of the new Municipal Districts and the preparation of the Local Economic and Community Plans will be better placed to inform the vision for the future of areas.</p> <p>3) Strategic employment areas have been identified where there are very large sites available for large scale developments within the Cork Gateway. Clonakilty has been recognised as having an enhanced employment function with a regional basis and this is considered an appropriate designation given its current</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>that the Council identifies the West Cork Business and Technology Park as a Strategic Employment Area in Policy EE 4-1 and allow for a wider range of uses at the Technology Park including general office uses over 400sqm similar to the strategy for office development used in Cork City. 4) It is also suggested that Clonakilty is placed in the second tier of employment locations within Table 6.1.</p>	<p>4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for a wider range of uses at the Technology Park including general office uses over 400sqm similar to the strategy for office development used in Cork City?</p> <p>5) Should the Draft Plan be amended to place Clonakilty in the second tier of employment locations within Table 6.1?</p>	<p>mix of employment uses and employment land zonings.</p> <p>4) The Park is currently zoned for Enterprise Development, which is the highest level of employment land designation to reflect is enhanced regional employment status. Any dilution of this by expanding the range of uses would not be appropriate as it would undermine the Parks unique status in the sub region and pose a significant threat to existing and future employment lands located within Clonakilty.</p> <p>5) The top tier of the employment hierarchy consists of the settlements within the Cork Gateway and the Hub Town of Mallow as set out in the NSS. Clonakilty is located in the second tier with the rest of the county towns but its enhanced employment function with a regional focus has been recognised.</p> <p>It is intended to consider amending Table 6.1 “Employment Hierarchy” to recognise the role of Clonakilty as an important employment centre.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Marten Brian dCDP14/1924</p>	<p>The importance of heritage and landscape in the County is outlined in this submission and the following suggestions have been made by the submitter;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More of an effort should be made in the preservation of old buildings and rural farm houses and even ruined stone houses which are a very important element of this heritage yet cannot be placed in the record of protected structures. 2. The replacement rather than demolition of houses dating from the 1900's is more favourable so as to protect the stone-building that define the West Cork Landscape. The scale may make them unsuitable for modern living but they could be sensitively incorporated into a new building. 3. Houses should be built so that they fit more naturally into the landscape and lessen the need for extensive excavation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge the preservation of old buildings and rural farm houses and even ruined stone houses which are a very important element of this heritage yet cannot be placed in the record of protected structures 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge that the replacement rather than demolition of houses dating from the 1900's is more favourable so as to protect these stone-buildings? 3. Should the old Baltimore Fishery Boat Building sheds and associated slipway be included on the RPS? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Plan encourages proposals for the sensitive renovation and conservation of existing disused or derelict dwellings in objective RCI 7-4. In such circumstances, the dwelling must be physically capable of undergoing renovation / conversion without demolition. 2. See 1 above 3. The former Baltimore Fishery school site (including the slipway) forms an important part of the history of Baltimore and the buildings have architectural merit in themselves and should be included in the RPS. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required. 2. See 1 above. 3. Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>into hillsides which result in an ugly imposition on the landscape.</p> <p>4. Enforcement of a condition 'use of local stone' on boundary walls of all new dwellings and specify in planning conditions.</p> <p>5. Addition to RPS of the old Baltimore Fishery School boat building sheds in Baltimore with the associated slipway has an important part in the history and Heritage of Baltimore. The nearby engine house is already a heritage building.</p>			
<p>McCarthy, Fr. Pat P.P. dCDP14/1721</p>	<p>Submission expresses concern that young couples are being refused permission to set up a home within the Ardfield / Rathbarry parish boundaries, which is forcing them to live elsewhere. Submission requests that these planning decisions be rescinded and everything possible done to support young families to set up homes in their own parish.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>McCutcheon Halley Walsh dCDP14/1909</p>	<p>Submission states that the X-01 Masterplan as it has been set out in the 2011 LAP has been unsuccessful in progressing or providing any prospect of development for Ballyvolane. States that the development of Ballyvolane which has been a priority since 2001 CASP should not be delayed indefinitely by an appropriate and unworkable Masterplan requirement. Submission proposes an amendment to Table 15.1 of the Draft CDP to expedite housing development in Ballyvolane, so that the lands within the X-01 area can be brought forward for development without the requirement for a Masterplan. States that given the urgent need for development land in Ballyvolane, it is requested that the western portion of the subject lands be zoned / identified for development. States that in the event that the Masterplan requirement is retained, it is proposed that</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork? 2. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to expedite housing development in Ballyvolane, so that the lands within the X-01 area can be brought forward for development without the requirement for a Master plan? 	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”.</p> <p>3. The Draft Plan is not the appropriate place to amend the master plan requirement at Ballyvolane. The issues raised will be addressed in the preparation of the master plan and the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>contingency provisions be provided which allows developers / landowners to proceed with development within X-01 - within the western portion of the subject lands.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Miller, Tony dCDP14/1716</p>	<p>This submission recognises the need for renewable energy but states there is too much focus on wind farm development in rural areas. The following concerns outlined;</p> <p>1. Very little reference in draft plan to the consequences that industrial-sized wind developments have on rural communities such as proximity issues, noise and shadow flicker, property devaluation, disruption on vulnerable road networks, reduction in tourism potential and industrialization of the landscape.</p> <p>2. The 2006 guidelines outdated as turbines taller and buffers inappropriate.</p> <p>3. Turbines fail and break.</p> <p>4. EU member states pulling out of binding targets on renewables and cannot be relied upon to buy excess wind energy from Ireland.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the consequences that industrial-sized wind developments have on rural communities be referenced adequately in draft plan?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended so as to acknowledge that the 2006 guidelines are outdated as turbines are taller and buffers inappropriate.</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to note that EU member states are pulling out of binding targets on renewables, that there is instability in the grid system and that Job creation in wind energy not true?</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to note that the Clustering of wind farms under</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” It is considered that the Draft Plan sets out sufficient policies and objectives to guide wind farm developments so that it does not unduly impact on rural communities.</p> <p>2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>3. The Draft Plan complies with national policy to encourage renewable energy development including onshore wind energy.</p> <p>4. The Gate process is not part of the planning process. Each individual planning application is dealt with case by</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>5. Instability in the grid system with wind as it is intermittent and unpredictable and results in inefficiencies on traditional power sources.</p> <p>6. Submission states that job creation in wind energy is not true as the manufacturing jobs are abroad with small number of jobs in site preparation and maintenance.</p> <p>7. Extracts from the Energy Background Document outlined and queries raised in relation to electricity demand and consumption.</p> <p>8. Clustering of wind farms under the Gate Process results in noncompliance with Aarhus Convention and European Landscape Convention.</p> <p>9. Cumulative effects of wind development. Submission continues by commending the commitment to Green</p>	<p>the Gate Process results in noncompliance with Aarhus Convention and European Landscape Convention.</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended so as to consider the cumulative effects of wind development?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide greater access to archaeological monuments?</p> <p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the designation of Scenic Routes S32, S33 and S34 is raised from a medium to a high landscape value?</p>	<p>case via development management and national guidelines and development plan objectives.</p> <p>5. Cumulative effect is a planning consideration that is taken into account when assessing individual planning applications.</p> <p>6. A long term goal of section 12.3 Archaeological Heritage is to develop a management plan if resources allow for the archaeology of County Cork, which could include an evaluation of the Historic Character Assessment of Cork County helping to identify areas for tourism potential, and strategic research while also promoting best practice in archaeology and encouraging the interpretation, publication and dissemination of archaeological findings.</p> <p>7. The current overall landscape value designation is considered appropriate and the Scenic Routes should retain existing designations.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Infrastructure. Recommends greater access to archaeological monuments and designation of Scenic Routes S32, S33 and S34 be raised from a medium to a high landscape value.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Mulvihill, Dan dCDP14/1719</p>	<p>This submission requests that 1. Lower densities should be allowed along the rail corridor. 2. Requests a more detailed survey should be carried out and a detail list of all infrastructure required to enable the zoned land to be built on. 3. Requests a clear statement on how the provision of services of zoned land in the future will be provided - including the setting up of a co-ordinated body representing the various bodies responsible for the services. 4. The elimination of parking levies in relation to change of use or extension in town centres is welcomed. 5. Suggests that costs should be eliminated or minimised where possible including elimination of Part V, reduction of financial contributions in Planning Permissions eliminate the supplementary planning contributions including the rail contribution, eliminate the 80% windfall tax, look at alternative</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a provision for lower density development along the rail line? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a detailed list of all infrastructure required enabling the zoned land to be built on? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give a commitment to the establishment of an Implementation Group made up of key infrastructure providers to ensure that sufficient priority is given to delivering the infrastructure required to meet the development plan targets? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the issue of reducing financial contributions on development?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan includes a new more flexible approach to housing density which could facilitate lower densities in some areas and progress will be monitored and reviewed at the 2 year Chief Executive's Report. 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs" 3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs" 4. It is intended to review development contributions during the lifetime of the plan.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required. 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs" 3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs" 4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>means for the provision of services to zoned lands including central funding, an alternative means of providing funding for Bonds.</p>			
<p>Munster Agricultural Society dCDP14/1915</p>	<p>Submission includes details on history of the Munster Agricultural Society. Submission requests - 1. Additional text added to Section 5.5 of the Draft CDP and amendments to SC 5-1 (Recreation and Amenity) to reflect Council support for the establishment of Cork Showground's at Curraheen. 2. Removal of Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt designations from the subject lands. 3. Proposes additional text to GI 8-1. 4. That the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for future consideration of additional integrated uses such as sporting and show grounds in the Metropolitan Green Belt to the west of Cork City?</p> <p>2. Can the Macroom EA LAP be amended to zone UCC and MAS lands?</p>	<p>1. Policy Objectives RCI 5-5 and GI 8-1 do not preclude Active and Recreational Uses within Greenbelt Lands.</p> <p>2. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Macroon EA LAP be varied to zone UCC and MAS lands.			
<p>Murnane O'Shea Limited dCDP14/1887</p>	<p>This submission welcomes the changes proposed to the residential density policy, however it requests that R-03 in Glanmire would be better categorised as Medium B rather than Medium A in order to reflect the site's challenging topography and to accommodate the early delivery of new housing stock to the Glanmire market.</p>	<p>1. Support for the revision to the density categories.</p> <p>2. Can R-03 in Glanmire be categorised as Medium B rather than Medium A?</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. See also Section 2 (c). Consideration will be given to categorising R-03 as Medium B during the forthcoming amendments to the Local Area Plans.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. See also Section 2 (c) Amendment Required to the Blarney EA LAP.</p>
<p>National Oil Reserve Agency (NORA) dCDP14/1725</p>	<p>NORA supports the proposed policy objective ED 1-2: Future Development of the County's oil and gas reserves, (from the Draft County Development Plan, Chapter 9: Energy and Digital Economy) which seeks to ensure secure, reliable and safe supplies of electricity, gas and oil in order to maximize their value, maintain inward</p>	<p>NORA supports the proposed policy objective ED 1-2 and welcomes the adoption of this policy objective in the final Plan.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	investment, support indigenous industry and create jobs. Accordingly, the Agency would welcome the adoption of this policy objective ED 1-2 in the final Plan.			
National Oil Reserves Agency (NORA) dCDP14/1726	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1725	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1725	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1725	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1725
National Roads Authority dCDP14/1742	Approach taken in the plan towards national roads is generally supported. It advocates that the protection of safety, carrying capacity and efficiency of existing and future network is key and that integrated approaches to land use and transport solutions should be continued. The submission suggests some areas for improvement including other points of information: 1) Importance of strategic role of road network to be included in Core Strategy. 2) Include reference to Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines 2012 (Section 10.3.3 of Plan). 3)	1) Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to reflect the strategic role of the national road network for Cork? 2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include reference to the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines 2012 of the Department of the Environment Community Heritage and Local Government (Section 10.3.3 of Plan)? 3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to cross reference policy 3-1 (c & d) 'potential to generate demand for national	1) It is considered that the text of the Core Strategy can be amended to reflect the important role of the national road network in the economic development of the Cork Region as set out in the Core Strategy Diagram. 2) It is intended to include this reference. 3) It is intended to consider including additional text to cross reference policies as requested.	1) Amendment Required 2) Amendment Required 3) Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Cross reference of policy 3-1 (c & d) 'potential to generate demand for national road frontage development' with other plan chapters e.g. 4, 6, 8 & 9. 4) Less restrictive approaches to policy 3-1 (c & d) should be in conjunction with NRA and be plan led. 5) Mapping of roads (fig 10-2) is unclear for some schemes. 6) Projects should be included in Chapter 15 'Putting the Plan into Practice' especially the critical projects set out in objective TM 3-1(a). 7) NRAs road improvement programme is outlined. 8) Refer to N40 Demand Management Study. 9) Service Area Policy currently updating. 10) Policy document on Service Areas TM 3-1(f) has been superseded by Section 2.8 of DoECLG's 2012 Guidelines. 11) Plan led approach to the provision of off-line motorway service areas is within 2012 Guidelines 12) Include reference to Section 3.8 of the 2012 Guidelines to control</p>	<p>road frontage development' with other plan chapters e.g. 4, 6, 8 & 9?</p> <p>4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that restrictive approaches to policy 3-1 (c & d) should be in conjunction with NRA and be plan led?</p> <p>5) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include clearer mapping of roads as (fig 10-2) is unclear for some schemes?</p> <p>6) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include projects in Chapter 15 'Putting the Plan into Practice' especially the critical projects set out in objective TM3-1(a)?</p> <p>7) Should the Draft Plan be amended to make reference to the N40 Demand Management Study?</p> <p>8) Should the Draft Plan be amended to take account that the NRA's policy document on Service</p>	<p>4) Noted.</p> <p>5) Consideration will be given to improving clarity of mapping.</p> <p>6) Consideration will be given to adding additional projects set out in TM3-1(a) to Chapter 15.</p> <p>7) Consideration will be given to additional text to address this matter.</p> <p>8) It is intended to amend the text to reflect this.</p>	<p>4) No Amendment Required</p> <p>5) Amendment Required</p> <p>6) Amendment Required</p> <p>7) Amendment Required</p> <p>8) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	proliferation of signage on or adjoining national roads.	<p>Areas TM3-1(f) has been superseded by Section 2.8 of DoECLG's 2012 Guidelines?</p> <p>9) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include reference to Section 3.8 of the 2012 Guidelines to control proliferation of signage on or adjoining national roads?</p>	<p>9) Additional text to be included to reflect this.</p>	<p>9) Amendment Required</p>
<p>National Roads Office CCC dCDP14/1762</p>	<p>This submission welcomes the references to the Noise Action Plans in section 13.13 of the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2013 and request that in order to further strengthen the objectives in relation to noise that careful consideration is given to the location of noise sensitive developments so as to ensure they are protected from major noise sources where practical. The submission notes that this should be implemented through the use of distance, screening, or internal layout in preference to sole reliance on sound insulation. In addition, it requests that objective TM 3-1 Item (h)</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to extend objective TM3-1(h) to include Regional and Local Roads?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give careful consideration to the location of noise sensitive developments and to ensure the Planning Authority will have regard to the Noise Maps in the Action Plans, when assessing planning applications?</p>	<p>1. It is proposed to add additional text to Objective TM 3-1 to address this issue.</p> <p>2. It is intended to strengthen the Plan's Policy relating to Noise Emissions in Section 13.13.</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required</p> <p>2. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>should be extended to the Regional & Local Roads section. The submission notes that road traffic is the most significant noise source in the Cork Area and the number of vehicles/ HGV’s on the road as one of the key factors in noise generation and currently, the Major Roads category as defined in the END, i.e. National Roads and Regional Roads with flows over 8,200 vehicles per day, contains some regional roads in Cork. Finally, the submission requests that the planning authority will have regard to the Noise maps in the Action Plans, when assessing planning applications.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>National Transport Authority dCDP14/1851</p>	<p>1) Supports the plans policies on rural housing within Metropolitan Cork and wider CASP areas. 2) Supports the prioritisation of development in locations which facilitate development consolidation within defined public transport corridors. 3) Recommends that housing densities be determined on the basis of clearly presented public transport service level objectives and not solely on the basis of the capacity and frequency of existing public transport services. 4) Favour the prioritisation of future employment development on the basis of clearly defined employment types combined with associated locational, operational and employee accessibility requirements. 5) Transport and Mobility Chapter generally subscribes to the objective of encouraging a modal shift. 6) Welcomes objectives to encourage greater use of the suburban rail</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to determine housing densities on the basis of clearly presented public transport service level objectives and not solely on the basis of capacity and frequency of existing public transport services?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage greater use of the suburban rail network?</p> <p>3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include more restrictive car parking standards in the City Environs and adjacent population and employment centres, in addition to Douglas. Plan should include an intention to restrict parking standards in appropriate urban locations as the omission of this may be detrimental to the long term viability of public transport services.</p>	<p>1) The Draft Plan sets out a clear approach to housing densities which provides for improve flexibility which is more in tune with market demand and has gained broad support among key stakeholders. The key consideration is to locate the housing in the most sustainable locations to take advantage of both existing and future planned public transport services</p> <p>2) It is considered that Objective TM 2-5 provides sufficient encouragement to use the suburban rail network.</p> <p>3) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Transport and Mobility”</p> <p>In accordance with paragraphs 10.4.11-10.4.12 of the Draft Plan consideration could be given to a reduction in parking standards in specific locations where commitments to deliver improved public transport are secured.</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required</p> <p>2) No Amendment Required</p> <p>3) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Transport and Mobility”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>network. Same policy should apply to bus corridors. 7) Emphasises the importance of achieving a common, agreed approach to car parking standards and their application between the City and County Councils including application of such a standard to Ballincollig, the Airport and Little Island. 8) Plan should include an intention to restrict parking standards in appropriate urban locations as the omission of this may be detrimental to the long term viability of public transport services and their improvement reducing the potential to encourage people to change their behaviour over time.</p>	<p>4) Should the Draft Plan text 10.2.21 and Fig 10-1 be amended as it is now inaccurate?</p>	<p>4) The text and diagram will be changed as appropriate.</p>	<p>4) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>O'Brien and O'Flynn (Wilton) Ltd. dCDP14/1912</p>	<p>Submission requests that White's Cross is removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt and recognised as a 'Village Nucleus' with an established development boundary.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the supply of land identified in the Plan and the respective LAPs is sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs".</p> <p>The identification of new village nuclei is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs".</p>
<p>O'Brien and O'Flynn (Wilton) Ltd. dCDP14/1913</p>	<p>Submission proposes an amendment to Table 7.1 to identify neighbourhood centres within the Metropolitan cork Area including a new neighbourhood centre on the subject lands at Sarsfield Road, Wilton. States that it is inappropriate to leave a lack of clarity in relation to the designation of neighbourhood centres within Metropolitan</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to support a proposal for new neighbourhood centre on lands at Sarsfield Road, Wilton?</p>	<p>1. Table 7.1 states that the opportunity for development of new neighbourhood or local centres will be identified in Development Plans or Local Area Plans as appropriate. It is considered that they may be more appropriately indicated in Local Area Plans.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Cork, pending the review of the LAP's. States that there is an under provision of local / neighbourhood centres in the Sarsfield Road area of wilton. States there is a policy vacuum for the development of further neighbourhood services which will have a negative impact on any planning applications for extending the neighbourhood centre within the settlement.</p>			
<p>O'Brien, Noel dCDP14/1834</p>	<p>Requests that Rural Housing Category (a) be amended to have regard to persons re-locating an established farm to the area. Submission also requests that the Council addresses Section 4.4.3 of the Draft CDP to ensure that this section be relaxed when the move into a Town Greenbelt is related to agriculture and where the applicant can provide documentation that they have exhausted attempts to secure lands outside the green belt. Submission has concern that the policy as written could preclude those</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise the categories of Rural Generated Housing Need?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Para 4.4.3 so that it allows for more flexibility in moving from one Rural Housing Policy Area to another?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p> <p>2. It is considered reasonable that generally applicants will not be permitted to move from an area under less urban pressure to an area under more urban pressure for rural housing. This only applies while moving into the Metropolitan or Town Green Belts.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Rural Coastal and Islands".</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	actively engaged in agriculture that are not taking over the ownership or running of an existing farm from securing a home in some instances.			
<p>O'Donnabhain, Daithi dCDP14/1829</p>	<p>This submission relates to issues and requirements for Ballincollig. (1) The submission notes that the ‘Green Route’ Project has raised a number of practical problems and suggests that a plan similar to the DLUTS should be undertaken in the Ballincollig area to take account of the numerous issues and challenges in proposed future development and tackling current transportation and development issues. In terms of the retail classification of Ballincollig, the submission argues that it be afforded a higher priority. (2) It notes that Ballincollig requires a dynamic</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to influence the delivery of the larger strategic residential and employment sites in Metropolitan Cork? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make provision for the preparation of a DLUTS type plan for Ballincollig? 3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include policies to address vacancy in the town? 4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that provision 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 2. This is a matter for the next LAP review. Any such study should form an important background document to inform that review. 3. Chapter 7 sets out detailed policies to tackle the issue of vacancy in town centres. 4. This issue should be addressed in the next LAP review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 2. No Amendment Required. 3. No Amendment Required. 4. No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>and creative approach to tackle the vacancy issue and suggests that an area strategy plan could encompass identifying vacant premises, consultation with the property owners, consultation with existing businesses, and the formulation of an immediate strategy to foster new business and greater occupancy. (3) It is also noted that locally based companies require premises and facilities of varying scale and provision must be made in this regard. (4) The requirement for the increased provision of waste water facilities is outlined. (5) Finally, the multi faceted advantages of the walking trail linking Carrigrohane to the Regional Park is noted, including increased access to the existing historical area of the Powdermills and thereafter to the Regional Park.</p>	<p>is made for the expansion of existing employment uses in the town?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a specific objective for the extension of Lee fields to Ballincollig Regional Park?</p>	<p>5. This proposal is supported in Para 5.5.5 and 5.5.6 in Chapter 5.</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
O'Driscoll, Gearoid dCDP14/1824	Requests that the subject property (83, North Main St, Bandon) be removed from the list of Protected Structures in the Draft CDP.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete 83, North Main St, Bandon from the list of Protected Structures?	The structure of the interior of 83 North Main St is unique. Externally No 83 looks like a 19th century building, however internally it is 17th century, and late medieval timber-framed house and should included on the RPS.	1. No Amendment Required.
Office of Public Works dCDP14/1895	<p>Submission welcomes ref to the Guidelines, detail regard the CFRAM Studies and flood relief schemes, ref to the Flood Risk and Zoning and detail on the application of Planning Permissions in areas of flood risk.</p> <p>1. Welcomes comments in Paragraph 11.6.12 to 11.6.17. Suggests detail can be added on to how carry out a site specific flood risk assessment, with respect to the Guidelines and if</p>	Should the Flood Risk section of the Draft Plan be amended to provide further information and guidance?	1. Consideration will be given to the inclusion of additional text where appropriate.	1. Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the area of interest is within an area of flood risk uncertainty.</p> <p>2. Notes 11.6.8 and highlights if these maps are to be used for a Stage 2 FRA, there is a need to validate these maps. In particular around structures, this can be carried out through a validating exercise of the modelled map outlines against historical event outlines.</p> <p>3. In relation to SFRA Appendix A, notes the text of 1.4.1 and understands that the CDP has carried out a Stage 1 FRA. 1.5.3- notes the sources of information used in the identification of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Suggested additional sources of flood risk information are used at this stage, such as the Irish Coastal Protection Strategy Study (ICPSS) coastal flood maps. 1.5.7 - highlights the current updated sources of flood risk information, such as the ICPSS maps. Such</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>information should be included in any revised flood maps during the LAP's, while bearing in mind the availability (or not) of the CFRAM flood risk maps.</p> <p>5. Table A1: Understands this as the Countywide flood risk identification. Suggest text included to confirm this. Suggests this Flood Risk Identification be highlighted on a map view.</p>			
<p>O'Flynn Construction dCDP14/1798</p>	<p>Submission states that the Draft CDP should more explicitly recognise the existing substantial retail role of Ballincollig. Submission welcomes objectives to tackle retail vacancy, in the context of ensuring flexibility to attract further appropriate comparison retail to the town. Submission requests that (a) an additional column should be added to the table identifying retail hierarchy levels, as provided in table 7.2.1 of the Metro Cork Joint Retail Study. This should clearly depict</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to show that Metropolitan Towns and District Centres are within the same tier in terms of Retail Hierarchy? 2. Should the Draft Plan text in relation to the General Retail Function and Policy description for Metropolitan Towns be amended to delete reference to 'modest' comparison retailing? 3. Should the Draft Plan paragraph 7.7.6 be slightly amended to ensure regard is 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Metropolitan Towns and District Centres are at the same level in the hierarchy. It is proposed to amend Table 7.1 to address this issue. 2) The word "modest" is intended to be descriptive only; however it is proposed to replace it with the word "varied". 3) Additional wording will be considered for paragraph 7.7.6. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Amendment Required. 2) Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>that Metropolitan Towns and District Centres are within the same tier in terms of Retail Hierarchy, (b) The General Retail Function and Policy description for Metropolitan Towns should be amended to delete reference to 'modest' comparison retailing and (c) Paragraph 7.7.6 should be slightly amended to ensure regard is given to the suitability of existing vacant units in terms of size, type and location for any proposed new development.</p>	<p>given to the suitability of existing vacant units in terms of size, type and location for any proposed new development?</p>		<p>3) Amendment Required</p>
<p>O'Flynn Construction dCDP14/1799</p>	<p>Submission states the draft CDP makes no reference to the need to provide appropriate neighbourhood services for Little Island's residential, workforce, population and the settlement is not clearly designated as a 'neighbourhood centre' within the retail policy framework. No recognition of the established retail warehousing units within Eastgate and no support for addressing vacancy rates in</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify the retail role of Little Island? 2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the name of all the neighbourhood centres identified within the Joint Metropolitan Retail Study?</p>	<p>1) Little Island has been identified as a Neighbourhood Centre in Metropolitan Retail Study. The future role of Little Island is a matter for the next LAP review. 2) It is considered appropriate to only list neighbourhood centres within the Metropolitan Retail Study and not the Strategy as they are not of a strategic nature. The next review of the Local Area Plans can identify new and existing neighbourhood centres where appropriate.</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required 2) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>existing retail warehousing locations. Welcomes the designation of Little Island as a Strategic Employment Area, but states there is a policy vacuum in terms of supporting the development of appropriate retail and retail services development to serve the existing residential and workforce population. Need for policy to support full occupancy in established retail warehousing locations. Requests the following (a) Amend Table 7.1 'Retail Hierarchy' to name the neighbourhood centres identified within the Joint Metropolitan Retail Study; or include a statement that neighbourhood centres within the Metropolitan area, pending review of LAPs, are as identified within the Joint Metropolitan Retail Study (b) Amend Table 7.1, 'Retail Hierarchy' to make reference to residential and workforce population (c) Amend Policy EE 2-1 'Overall</p>	<p>3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to make reference to residential and workforce population within the Retail Hierarchy?</p> <p>4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Objective EE 2-1 'Overall Strategy for Economic Development' to emphasise the importance of the provision of appropriate retail and retail services as part of a high quality work place environment?</p>	<p>3) The approach to retail provision in the Draft Plan is based on the Retail Planning Guidelines. Any applications for additional convenience facilities within the Metropolitan Area will be considered on their merits. The designation within the retail hierarchy relates primarily to population base rather than employment base as retail expenditure is much more closely aligned with resident population than employment numbers.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to meet the retail needs of local workforce populations, however it is not appropriate to over provide in such locations in order to draw customers in from other residential areas.</p> <p>4) Objective EE 2-1 is a strategic overarching objective and it would not be appropriate to specifically include retail and retail services in the wording.</p>	<p>3) Amendment Required</p> <p>4) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Strategy for Economic Development' to emphasise the importance of the provision of appropriate retail and retail services as part of a high quality work place environment (d) Amend Objective TCR 10-1 to support the occupancy of established retail warehousing locations.</p>	<p>5) Should the Draft Plan be amended so that Objective TCR 10-1 supports the occupancy of established retail warehousing locations?</p>	<p>5) Consideration will be given to providing additional text to support the occupancy of existing retail warehousing in preference to providing new retail warehousing floorspace. Established retail warehousing locations have been recognised within the Joint Retail Study.</p>	<p>5) Amendment Required</p>
<p>O'Flynn, Cllr. Frank dCDP14/1733</p>	<p>This submission requests that all high voltage electricity scheme lines be put underground instead of the construction of overhead pylons in the interest of health and safety.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that all high voltage electricity scheme lines are put underground instead of the construction of overhead pylons?</p>	<p>1. The best option (underground or overground) for each particular site will be chosen having regard to the particular conditions or sensitivities pertaining to the site.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
O’Flynn, Cllr. Frank dCDP14/1734	Duplicate of submission dCDP14/1733	Duplicate of submission dCDP14/1733	Duplicate of submission dCDP14/1733	1. No Amendment Required.
O’Flynn, Michael dCDP14/1774	This submission expresses concern regarding the County Development Plan (CDP) review arguing that it is not addressing the key issues facing the County, including in particular how the plan can stimulate and encourage development and make a positive contribution to economic recovery. The submitter would like to see greater priority given to job creation issues, infrastructure provision and opportunities for commercial, retail and industrial development issues rather than one-off housing in rural areas. It is suggested that other planning authorities are taking a more innovate and proactive approach to job creation and economic development including the City Development Plan Issues Paper included a dedicated ‘Economic Development Strategy’ focusing	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for the preparation of an Economic Development Strategy with particular reference to the modern day needs of the key knowledge-economy industry sectors, indigenous companies (agri-food and blue growth) and other key growth sectors?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide more information in relation to the Council’s Retail Strategy particularly the retail centres of the County?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan Core Strategy be amended to help deliver the water services and transport infrastructure required?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”.</p> <p>2. The Draft Retail Study and Retail Background Papers provide detailed information to support the policies set out in the Draft Retail Strategy. Additional text and changes to Table 7.1 will be considered to clarify the role of Metropolitan Towns in the Retail Network.</p> <p>3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”.</p>	<p>1) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”.</p> <p>2) Amendment Required.</p> <p>3) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>on areas to promote/attract more business both locally generated and FDI. The submission also requests that more information is provided in relation to the Council’s Retail Strategy particularly the retail centres of the county. Finally, the submission raises serious concerns regarding the infrastructure constraints many of which it is noted are designated for significant growth and their infrastructure deficits will not be addressed for a considerable period of time.</p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to give a commitment to the establishment of an Implementation Group made up of key infrastructure providers to ensure that sufficient priority is given to delivering the infrastructure required to meet the development plan targets?</p>	<p>4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>	<p>4) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>O'Keeffe, Eustace dCDP14/1832</p>	<p>Submission requests that the subject lands are excluded from the Prominent and Strategic Greenbelt area.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt Map be amended?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified the importance of protecting prominent areas of the Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt which are of strategic importance to the purpose and function of the greenbelt and greenbelt settlements. These areas are made up of prominent open hilltops, valley sides and ridges which give Metropolitan Cork its distinctive character and the Plan recognises the importance of protecting these areas.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p>
<p>O'Keeffe, Paul & Shiels, Damian dCDP14/1889</p>	<p>This submission provides a historical context for the Kinsale Battlefield and background to the Project. It also sets out a number of recommendations regarding the protection and conservation of archaeological sites and also requests that a specific objective should be included in the new county development plan undertaking to give due consideration to the protection of the battlefield and siege-related sites within the</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a specific objective undertaking to give due consideration to the protection of the battlefield and siege-related sites within the planning system?</p>	<p>1. Chapter 12 Heritage includes a section - Battlefield and Siege Sites (section 12.3.13) which acknowledges the significance of battlefields and indicates that consideration will be given to the conservation and protection of the significant battlefield sites in County Cork.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>planning system. In addition it is requested that the referral of planning applications to the County Archaeologist should be based on the Zone of Notification around each site and not on the single pinpoint dots with which the sites are located on the SMR. The submission includes a number of illustrations identifying some of the key sites. It is recommended that consideration be given to the archaeological sensitivity of the overall siege landscape (Illus. 16). At a minimum, proposed developments within this landscape should be referred to the County Archaeologist. In addition, it requests that special consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of development and how this may negatively affect the archaeological resource and landscape quality, as well as the potential to develop this landscape as a cultural tourism attraction.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>O'Mahony, Mr Sean dCDP14/1741</p>	<p>The submission requests that (1) The plan should include a clear statement of what consequences the proposed abolition of Town Councils would have on the services currently provided to the residents and clarify number of Town Council's (2) calls for a more coordinated approach to surveying and development of strategic scenic route sites. Requests that (3) the plan should contain an explanation of how the 'Wild Atlantic Way' proposals are to be incorporated in its programs and policies, (4) that it should include an assessment of the extent of upgrading to the road system needed to cater for tourist traffic, (5) that the plan should include a statement of priorities for developing a comprehensive network of walkways and (6) an objective of establishing public rights of way to all significant features, including the coastline. In relation to tree heritage</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide more detail regarding the impact the abolition of the Town Councils will have on existing services?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include more detail on how the 'Wild Atlantic Way' will be incorporated into its programs and policies?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide more detail regarding TPOs including its procedure and mapped locations of protected trees? Should the Draft Plan include a policy that all native tree species which are rare and / or vulnerable to extinction in the County should be added to the list of Protected Species?</p>	<p>1. This is not a matter for the County Development Plan. All of the services provided by the Towns to date will be transferred to the County Council, in accordance with the Local Government Reform Act, 2014.</p> <p>2. The Wild Atlantic Way is acknowledged as a tourism initiative in section 8.1.10 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the Draft Plan has provided sufficient information relating to TPO's and further guidance is provided in the Tree Preservation Guidelines for Planning Authorities, March 1994, Department of Environment, and Part XIII 'Amenities', of the Planning and Development Act, 2000.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>protection, the submission requests that (7) the Council implement the system of TPO's and contain a summary explanation of how the TPO procedure operates in providing mapped locations of the trees protected by a TPO (8) all native tree species which are rare and / or vulnerable to extinction in the County should be added to the list of Protected Species (9) requests that the plan should formally identify a category of landscape enclosures of heritage significance and provide an inventory of these (10) that a system of protection / conservation be established for these listed sites, comparable with that already applying to ACAs.</p>	<p>4. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify the extent of road upgrade needed to cater for tourist traffic?</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to formally identify a category of landscape enclosures of heritage significance and provide an inventory of these and that a system of protection / conservation is established for these listed sites, comparable with that already applying to ACAs?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to establish rights of way to all significant features, including the coastline?</p>	<p>4. This is not a matter for the County Development Plan. Every year the County Council receives a national and non-national roads allocation for road maintenance in the county. All roads including important tourist routes must be maintained out of this fund which has reduced dramatically in recent years.</p> <p>5. Objective HE 4-3 provides protection to the important non- structural elements of the built heritage and section 12.4.12 states that Cork County Council prepared a guidance note; 'Guidance Notes for the Appraisal of Historic Gardens, Demesnes, Estates and their settings' in order to foster a better understanding of designated landscapes.</p> <p>6. The Plan sets out that the Council will, where requested, give consideration to the inclusion of rights of way in the CDP, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Act.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>O'Neill, Richard dCDP14/1740</p>	<p>This submission is from the owner of a well in Rathpeacon which is being suggested by another submitter for inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures. The submitter states that he has obtained permission from the local area engineer to remove the well because of antisocial behaviour at night time at the well, but because of health reasons was unable to act on that permission. The submitter also notes that he would be happy to give it to someone who would like to care for the well on their own property.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the well at Rathpeacon on the RPS?</p>	<p>The well does not appear to have sufficient architectural, artistic, technical, archaeological, cultural, artistic, scientific, social, or historical merit to justify inclusion on the RPS. No amendment is required. The architectural heritage protection guidelines suggest that where an otherwise unremarkable structure has historical associations, it may be more appropriate to commemorate the association with a wall-mounted plaque. In some cases holy wells can be considered but only where there is sufficient physical fabric for them to be defined as structures and this does not appear to be the case in this instance.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>O'Regan, Michael dCDP14/1865</p>	<p>Submission does not consider the subject lands are 'Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt' and requests they be solely zoned 'Metropolitan Greenbelt'. States that the subject lands are high landscape value and high landscape sensitivity in the Draft Landscape Strategy and this cannot be a determining factor for the two tiered</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to change Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt Map?</p>	<p>1. The Draft Plan has identified the importance of protecting prominent areas of the Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt which are of strategic importance to the purpose and function of the greenbelt and greenbelt settlements. These areas are made up of prominent open hilltops, valley sides and ridges which give Metropolitan Cork its distinctive character and the Plan recognises the importance of protecting these areas.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>approach to green belt policy that applies to the landholding. Submission is disappointed that a full review of A1 lands does not appear to have taken place.</p>			
<p>O'Reilly, Hugh dCDP14/1756</p>	<p>Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1. 1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>	<p>1. 1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Rural Coastal and Islands"</p>
<p>O'Shea, Pat and Tim dCDP14/1711</p>	<p>Submission requests that subject lands (33 Acres) within the Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt be included within the Cork Science and Innovation Park boundary. It is proposed that these lands should be utilised for the purposes of amenity, including sports pitches and sport facilities.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote an extension to the Science Park boundary?</p>	<p>The Draft Plan recognises the importance of promoting the Cork Science Park. A master plan has been prepared and approved for the Science Park. Any changes to the boundary of the Science Park are a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>O'Sullivan, Caitriona dCDP14/1850</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.</p>	<p>Should the Draft CDP be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
			<p>into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	
<p>O'Sullivan, Catherine Agnes dCDP14/1833</p>	<p>This submission states that the old thatched cottage in Gneeves Co Cork (RPS 01132) is in ruin and has not been inhabited in over 30 years and formally requests that RPS 01132 with an address at Gneeves, Co. Cork be de-listed and become un-protected. Submitter also notes correspondence with the County Conservation Officer. (2) In addition the submitter also owns the plot (.37) acre surrounding the structure and requests that this should be redeveloped which would bring the plot back to life and part of the community.</p>	<p>Should the draft plan be amended to delete the house at Gneeves from the RPS?</p>	<p>The house has sufficient architectural interest to justify its retention on the RPS. The house is still standing to eaves level although the roof appears to have collapsed in. The house could be protected from further deterioration through appropriate conservation work. The house should be retained on the RPS and therefore no amendment is required.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>O'Sullivan, Jerry dCDP14/1780</p>	<p>This submission refers to the Energy Background Paper, November 2010, Page 25 and requests that all turbines in County Cork proposed by a Wind Energy Farm/Development Company (excluding 'National Planning Exempt turbines'), shall be set back (restricted zone) from any occupied dwelling by the following ratios: turbine height less than 50 metres=750 metres setback; turbine height 50 to 100 metres=1000 metres setback; turbine height 100 to 150 metres=1250 metres setback; etc. The submission proposes that the residents within this restricted setback zone shall exercise a veto on planning permission being granted to proposed Wind Energy Farm/Development unless and until agreement can be reached between resident in occupied dwelling and the proposed Wind Energy</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for different separation distances from any occupied dwelling depending on size and scale of wind turbine?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Farm/Development Company.			
<p>O'Sullivan, Jerry dCDP14/1906</p>	<p>This submission refers to the Energy Background Paper, November 2010, Page 25 and requests that all turbines in County Cork proposed by a Wind Energy Farm/Development Company (excluding 'National Planning Exempt turbines'), shall be set back (restricted zone) from any occupied dwelling by the following ratios: turbine height less than 50 metres=750 metres setback; turbine height 50 to 100 metres=1000 metres setback; turbine height 100 to 150 metres=1250 metres setback; etc. The submission proposes that the residents within this restricted setback zone shall</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for different separation distances from any occupied dwelling depending on size and scale of wind turbine?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>exercise a veto on planning permission being granted to proposed Wind Energy Farm/Development unless and until agreement can be reached between resident in occupied dwelling and the proposed Wind Energy Farm/Development Company.</p>			
<p>O'Sullivan, Paul dCDP14/1831</p>	<p>Submission requests that the Draft CDP be amended to remove or exempt development charges levied on polytunnels and glasshouses to encourage and promote entrepreneurship, support small and medium business and enhance the diversification of the rural economy, which is critical in maintaining sustainable vibrant rural communities. States that the application of excessive fees on horticulture development by Cork County Council will not</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address the issue of reviewing financial contributions on development?</p>	<p>1. It is intended to review the development contribution scheme during the lifetime of the plan.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		enhance recreational access to the harbour from Cork Lower Harbour towns?	inclusion of additional text to Paragraph 4.8.4 where appropriate.	
<p>Peters, The Very Rev Christopher dCDP14/1710</p>	<p>Submission states that in order to maintain the 'Cathedral Hall' to a standard required for its use by church and community groups it will require further works in the future and the Select Vestry are anxious that its designation in the RPS will not adversely impact any opportunity to upgrade the facility in the future.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the designation in the RPS of 'Cathedral Hall' will not adversely impact any opportunity to upgrade the facility for its use by church and community groups? (Church Hall, Carbery's Lane Rosscarbery).</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete the Church Hall, Carbery's Lane Rosscarbery?</p>	<p>1 and 2. The sensitive upgrading of properties including RPS is encouraged in the Draft plan. The hall is listed on the NIAH as a structure of regional importance and is associated with Ross Cathedral which is a structure of national importance on the NIAH list and on the RPS (no 790). The plan should not be amended.</p>	<p>1 and 2. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Pharmaceutical Ireland dCDP14/1751</p>	<p>This submission concerns Objective ZU 3-7 of the draft plan, specifically paragraphs b) and c) require clarification in respect of Waste-to-Energy facilities. It would appear that paragraph b) excludes Waste-to-Energy from industrial areas</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Objective ZU 3-7 be amended to better reflect national waste management policy?</p>	<p>1. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p>	<p>1. Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>whilst paragraph c) appears to allow for consideration of such a facility in industrial areas. The Manager’s Key Issues and Recommendations Section 11 Report of 29th April 2013 addressed this issue and recommended that the Plan provide a “revised definition of industrial development...” however the subsequent text in Objective ZU 3-7 is unclear in this regard. It is therefore requested that the development plan Objective ZU 3-7 be amended so as not to exclude Waste to Energy facilities, as the provision of this type of essential recovery infrastructure is in line with EU and National Waste Policy.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Port of Cork dCDP14/1768</p>	<p>This submission firstly welcomes the publication of the draft plan and its strong and consistent support for the implementation for the Port's Strategic Development Plan. It makes two further requests (1) that the word 'largely' is removed from Paragraph 6.6.4 which currently reads 'that Ringaskiddy will handle the container business which will use largely road based transport' as it states that all containers unloaded at Ringaskiddy will be distributed by road freight. (2) Secondly, it requests that the port related areas of Ringaskiddy and Marino Point are comprised of reclaimed land which has an established industrial character and that it would be more appropriate therefore for the lands which are intended for future port redevelopment to be excluded from the 'High Value Landscapes' Maps.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove the word "Largely" from Para 6.6.4. 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove Ringaskiddy and Marino Point from the "High Value Landscape" designation? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proposed to remove the word "Largely" from Para 6.6.4 2. The intention of the plan is not to preclude development in High Value Landscapes, but to ensure that considerable care is required in order to successfully locate large scale developments in High Value Landscapes without them becoming unduly obtrusive. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendment Required. 2. No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
Purcell, Avril dCDP14/1723	This submission is critical of the on-line browser for the draft CDP stating that it was very cumbersome to use. The submission states that it took several attempts to load on the computer and when it finally did the background mapping (OSI or aerial) was not visible and the submitter was left with icons floating in a blue background making it very difficult to locate any thing. The submitter hopes this can be made more user friendly.	1. Can the online browser be made more user friendly?	1. The online browser was developed in order to provide a more user friendly format for people wishing to view the online maps. Where users experience difficulties the first port of call should be the Planning Policy Unit and this is stated on both the online submissions system and map browser, which also includes help videos to make the user experience as easy as possible. The Council will continue to review and update the online facility as the draft plan becomes finalised.	1. No Amendment Required.
Purcell, Avril dCDP14/1724	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1723	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1723	Duplicate of Submission dCDP14/1723	No Amendment Required.
Quinn, Annette dCDP14/1715	This submission notes that whilst the map browser for SPAs, RPS etc is welcome and long overdue there are no Grid Co-ordinates (IG or ING) with the Record of Protected Structures either in the RPS table itself or the map browser	Should IG or ING Grid Co-ordinates be made available on the Draft Plan Map Browser? Can it support the provision of a GIS spatial download facility from the map browser similar to the NIAH?	Consult with the ICT Department regarding the suitability of this. If possible consideration will be given to providing grid coordinates on map browser with the Review of the RPS in 2015.	No Amendment Required.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>info and requests that a GIS spatial download facility from the map browser similar to the NIAH and archaeology.ie would be of benefit to the professional user.</p>	<p>No Grid Co-ordinates (IG or ING) on map browser with the Record of Protected Structures and requests that a GIS spatial download facility from the map browser similar to the NIAH and archaeology.ie would be of benefit to the professional user.</p>		
<p>Rathbarry National School dCDP14/1748</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that young people who want to establish their first-time homes in the area are prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area. The local National School have concerns about pupil / teacher numbers if young families have to leave the parish because of planning restrictions. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community? 	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Rathbarry National School Parents Association dCDP14/1804</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish and support should be given to young families to set up homes in their own parish / community.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>
<p>Rathbarry Tidy Towns dCDP14/1752</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that it is vital that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area are prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area which has experienced high housing rates and above average vacancy rates which has lead to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural community to meet their own rural housing needs. States that local community organisations have concerns about their</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft CDP be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island".</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island".</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>sustainability. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>Rosner, Margaret dCDP14/1729</p>	<p>This submission refers to the Renewable Energy Section and raises the following points; 1) Wind energy strategy with 50% of Cork County “open to consideration” a concern given the significant residential occupancy and SPA designations. 2) Strategic plan required with areas open to consideration clustered and adjoining counties taken into account. 3) National renewable energy strategy required. 4) Economic alternatives to wind available in Cork with the existing agriculture base (bio fuel a viable option) and the Whitegate / Kinsale /Bantry terminals. 5) Other types of renewable energy are not adequately reflected and wind</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to reduce the areas Open To Consideration given the significant residential occupancy and SPA designations?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider alternative Renewables as other types of renewable energy are not adequately reflected?</p> <p>3. Should the plan be amended so that all cabling, whether interconnecting turbines or onward supply to grids is placed underground to minimize visual</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy” The Wind Energy Strategy Map is based on consideration of a number of criteria and key policy considerations including wind speeds and the need to protect Natura 2000/nature conservation sites, high value landscape, urban areas and the areas considered suitable/unsuitable in adjoining counties.</p> <p>2. Provision has been made for alternative renewables in Section 9.4 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>3. The best option (underground or overground) for each particular site will be chosen having regard to the particular conditions or sensitivities pertaining to the site.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p> <p>2.No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>cannot be pushed to the front of every County. 6) No industrial scale wind farm should be allowed in the absence of revised Wind Turbine Guidelines and until associated planning laws are in place. 7) Industrial scale wind turbine development should be on an individual basis with respect to hub height, layout, power, cluster number, cumulative noise and adjacent neighbours. The draft Marshall Day guidelines do not indicate this will happen. 8) Impact of associated electrical grid should be assessed and all cabling, whether interconnecting turbines or onward supply to grids should be placed underground to minimize visual impact. 9) Consultation with communities proposed. 10) Full detailed EIA on each turbine site location to deal with habitats (birds & wildlife), domestic & farm animals, etc. 11) Impact of noise and shadow flicker on all local residents</p>	<p>impact?</p>		

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	should be assessed.			
<p>Sandscope Fishing Club dCDP14/1793</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area should be prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing policy type for the area. States that local clubs / community organisations have concerns about their sustainability, unless plans are put in place which will support rural development, i.e. facilitate young people in getting</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	planning permission in the area.			
Sheridan, Chris dCDP14/1879	Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.	No Amendment Required.
Sheridan, Chris dCDP14/1880	This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail	Should the Draft be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy	No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?</p>	<p>strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	
<p>Shipton Group dCDP14/1845</p>	<p>(1) Requests a proactive focus for delivery of the Core Strategy which contributes to a strong metropolitan area. (2) Enable and deliver employment lead development in the existing or planned employment locations, or in proximity to the well established public bus network. (3) Provide clarity and guidance re location of residential and commercial development close to a rail node (4) Zoning land for Social and Community uses will not in itself deliver facilities (5) Queries table 5.1 "New School</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to focus development which contributes to a strong Metropolitan Area?</p> <p>(2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage employment lead development in the existing or planned employment locations?</p> <p>(3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide guidance on location of development close to</p>	<p>1) The Core Strategy of the plan puts forward a development strategy which gives priority to the Metropolitan Gateway followed by the 'Hub' town of Mallow in accordance with the NSS and SWRPG.</p> <p>2) The main existing and future employment centres are clearly identified.</p> <p>3) Significant development has been targeted along the commuter rail lines.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>Requirements for Main Settlements” – at odds with recent additional proposals for new schools in Carrigaline, (6) Key issue driving vacancy is unauthorised retail uses (7) Plan needs to be clear on the acceptable scale of District Centres and LAPs need to show existing and desired core retail areas (8) Queries Table 7.2 "Retail Floorspace Distribution in Metro Cork “figures (9)Development in the vicinity of tourism attractions should compliment / enhance it (10) Marine leisure should promote small scale access solutions that can be expanded (11) Outlines key actions to help increase walking and cycling (12) Comments on the parking and transportation sections including Appendix C (13) Plan should state that CFRAM maps are indicative only (14) Makes detailed comments on zoning of town centre sites (15) Need to include reference to roads as essential to the deliverability of</p>	<p>rail nodes?</p> <p>(4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to alter Table 5.1 "New School Requirements for Main Settlements"</p> <p>(5) Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that vacancy in town centres is driven by unauthorised retail uses elsewhere</p> <p>(6) Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide clearer guidance on the scale of District Centres?</p> <p>(7) Can the LAP's show existing and desired core retail areas with consistency and clarity?</p> <p>(8) Should the Draft Plan be amended to review Table 7.2 "Retail Floorspace Distribution in Metro Cork"</p>	<p>4) The data in Table 5.1 is provided by the Department of Education and Science and concerns additional new school sites to be identified in the next round of local area plans.</p> <p>5) Unauthorised retail uses can be one of a number of reasons that contribute to vacancy in town centres. The enforcement of such is a matter for the Enforcement Section of the County Council.</p> <p>6) The Retail Strategy and Retail Study provide guidance on the acceptable scale of District Centres while seeking to protect the primacy of the city centre.</p> <p>7) Objective TCR5-1 states that LAP's will identify 'primary' retail areas i.e. core retail areas and appropriate contiguous sites</p> <p>8) Table 7-2 will be further clarified.</p>	<p>4. No Amendment Required</p> <p>5. No Amendment Required</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required</p> <p>7. No Amendment Required</p> <p>8. Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the plan (16) Plan should ask stakeholders to assist with deliverability of the plan.</p>	<p>(9) Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that development around tourist attractions should compliment / enhance them?</p> <p>(10) Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote small scale access solutions for marine leisure activities?</p> <p>(11) Should the Draft Plan be amended to help increase walking and cycling?</p> <p>(12) Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage greater modal shift?</p> <p>(13) Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Objectives ZU 3-5, 3-6 and 3-8 in order to strengthen the role of town centres?</p> <p>14) Should the Draft Plan be amended to focus on locating employment based development close to transport hubs particularly in close proximity to</p>	<p>9) The Draft Plan provides guidance on development around tourist attractions.</p> <p>10) The Draft plan (objective RCI 8-4) provides support to the development of marine leisure facilities in the County.</p> <p>11) A suite of policies in Section 8.7 and 10.2 encourage cycling/walking.</p> <p>12) Chapter 10 sets out the Councils approach to encouraging a greater modal shift.</p> <p>13) It is considered that these objectives are sufficiently robust to protect the town centres role.</p> <p>14) The key provisions of the Transport and Mobility chapter seek to ensure that there is integrated transport and land-use planning and that employment based development is located in the most</p>	<p>9. No Amendment Required</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>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>town centres?</p> <p>15) Should the Draft Plan be amended to modify the parking requirements table as it is poorly worded and needs to be clarified?</p> <p>16) Should the Draft Plan be amended to have separate parking standards for District or Metropolitan Centres, North and South Environs as they are too broad?</p> <p>17) Should the Draft Plan be amended to state that the CFRAM Maps are indicative only?</p>	<p>efficient locations where greatest modal shift can be achieved.</p> <p>15) Parking table In Appendix C will be revised to ensure greater clarity.</p> <p>16) See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Transport and Mobility"</p> <p>In accordance with paragraphs 10.4.11-10.4.12 of the Draft Plan consideration could be given to a reduction in parking standards in specific locations where commitments to deliver improved public transport are secured.</p> <p>17) The existing Flood risk maps are the most accurate available and the Council has outlined its intention to update the flood maps as new information becomes available as set out in paragraph 11.6.8 of the Draft CDP. These maps give greater certainty to developers of areas at risk of flooding.</p>	<p>15. Amendment Required</p> <p>16. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Transport and Mobility"</p> <p>17. No Amendment Required</p>
<p>South Tipperary County Council dCDP14/1786</p>	<p>Submission states that the administrative border area between County Cork and County Tipperary has been</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan 7 Year Residency Requirement be increased to 10 years?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p> <p>It is not intended to increase the 7 Year</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>identified as a 'Stronger Rural Area' and whilst this is similar to the designation given in the South Tipperary County Development Plan 2009-2015, there is a difference in the minimum local residency requirements with respect to both Plans (The South Tipp Dev Plan specifies a 10 year requirement while the Draft CDP is proposing 7 years). States that this difference may encourage persons to seek sites in County Cork rather than Tipperary in areas close to the county boundary due to the lower timeframes involved. States that other designations and policies are generally complimentary and it is not anticipated that any transboundary conflict would occur.</p>		<p>Residency Requirement which is considered a sufficient timeframe to assess an applicant's connection to a local rural area.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Sr. Celestine dCDP14/1720</p>	<p>This submission requests 1) improved facilities for parking in Charleville including spaces for wheelchair users - the submission outlines the locations where these are required. 2) That a bus shelter is installed at the library side of Main Street and states that the 50km signage is too distant from the town centre. 3) That rural hedge cutting needs to be increased. 4) That services dealing with older persons or dependant persons are notified of ESB and County Council cut offs. 5) That the Capital Assistance Grant for the Charleville Sheltered Housing Services is expedited.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to address issues specific to Charleville regarding local improvements?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the Capital Assistance Grant for the Charleville Sheltered Housing Services is expedited?</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include specific transport infrastructural issues in relation to Charleville?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p> <p>2. This point is noted; however the County Development Plan has no direct role in the Capital Assistance Grant for Charleville.</p> <p>3. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required</p>
<p>St Joseph's Young Priests Society dCDP14/1765</p>	<p>States that planning restrictions are preventing young people from settling in Ardfield / Rathbarry parish. States that young people who want to establish their first-time primary homes in the area should be prioritised when granting planning permission in line with the rural housing</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft CDP be amended to recognise that sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community?</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>	<p>1 and 2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)"Rural Coastal and Island"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>policy type for the area. States that local community organisations /clubs have concerns about their sustainability if young people have to leave the parish. Requests that the following text 'sufficient development needs to be approved to sustain a vibrant community' be included in the 'Tourism and Rural Diversification', Section 4.4, of the Draft CDP.</p>			
<p>St. Anne's Heritage and Historical society Mallow Ltd. dCDP14/1727</p>	<p>This submission requests that the Development Plan makes reference to the fact that there is a need for a Visitors/ Heritage Centre for the Town of Mallow. The submission also notes that Cork County Council have stated they intend to have a Museum in their plans for the up grading of the Mallow Castle complex and that it would make more sense to have the Heritage and Museum in the one zone.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider the need for a Visitors/ Heritage Centre/Museum for the Town of Mallow and Mallow Castle complex in the one zone?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Sunberry Heights and Sunberry Drive dCDP14/1825</p>	<p>Submission requests the R-03 lands in Blarney be re-zoned as Green Belt.</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to include land presently zoned for residential development?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Templebreedy National School dCDP14/1814</p>	<p>Submission states that the subject school proposed for inclusion in RPS, which includes extensions and pre-fabs, does not fall into RPS status and expresses surprise at its designation. Submission states that the Board of Management are conscious of the 'beauty' of the original part of the building and the facade and have no intention of changing this. Submission is very concerned that the ongoing development of the school will be restricted if the constraint of 'Protected Structure' status is added to the building.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to delete Templebreedy National School from the Record of Protected Structures?</p>	<p>The original building is designated a regional structure associated with a national structure and should be in the RPS. It is not necessary to include the newer extensions in the listing and the listing could be amended to refer only to the original school house building.</p>	<p>Amendment required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Tesco Ireland dCDP14/1882</p>	<p>This submission makes comment on the “Draft Metropolitan Cork Joint Retail Strategy (December 2013)” and the “Non-Metropolitan Retail Background Paper” requesting the following (1) Resolve any anomalies between policy objective T-01 of the Blarney LAP and Section 4 of the Draft Strategy concerning the timing of the deliverability of retail development in the Ballyvolane District Centre. (2) Requests to acknowledge that low order comparison retail floor space will be facilitated in the short to medium term particularly where this is complementary to the larger convenience retail offer in a convenience store within a District Centre. (3) To promote in an equal manner the development of District centres across the North side having regard to prevailing retail deficiencies, anticipated future demand and having regard to the physical capacity of the respective sites to</p>	<p>1) Is there potential conflict with T-01 of the Blarney LAP and Section 4 of Draft Strategy regarding Ballyvolane?</p> <p>2) Should the Draft Plan be amended to promote development of District Centres across the North side in an equal manner?</p> <p>3) Should the Draft Plan be amended to make specific reference to a site in Clonakilty which it considers is suitable for</p>	<p>1) The approach to Ballyvolane as set out within the Retail Strategy and Study is in accordance with the approach set out within the 2011 Blarney EA LAP. Paragraph 2.3.5 of this plan outlines that: “given the population growth targeted for Ballyvolane, additional retail facilities will need to be provided at a new district centre serving the area”. It is within this context that the requirement for additional district centre facilities is identified within the LAP. Furthermore, given the proximity of the lands to the administrative boundary of Cork City Council it is considered important that co-ordinated approach to the development of district centre facilities at this location is advocated.</p> <p>2) The nature and scale of retail proposed within individual centres will be considered on its merits and in relation to overall impact on the primacy of the City Centre as per objective TCR 4-4.</p> <p>3) The review of the Local Area Plans will set out further guidance in relation to the appropriate scale and location of retail for individual towns and their</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required</p> <p>2) No Amendment Required</p> <p>3) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>accommodate growth. (4) It welcomes the identification of Clonakilty as a Tier 1 town in the Retail Hierarchy, but the Council must be pro-active in identifying suitable and viable sites to cater for the necessary retail expansion of Clonakilty. (5) States that the Town Centre Study Reports are a welcome addition to the Draft Development Plan however there are a number of potential comments in the study which are highlighted in the submission that it is argued, could potentially compromise the sustainable development of these towns and such statements must be reviewed.</p>	<p>retail?</p> <p>4) Is there potential for certain statements in background documents to compromise the sustainable development of certain towns?</p>	<p>catchments.</p> <p>4) The Town Centre Study reports were commissioned as part of background work in the preparation of the Draft Plan. They were intended to give an overall impression of town centres including the wider retail landscape of the county. Individual proposals from retail applicants will be considered on their merits and primarily informed by Retail Impact Assessments submitted by the applicants.</p>	<p>4) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>The Orchards, White Oaks and Meadow Grove, Cordolines, Manor Park, Old Cork Road, Canon Sheehan Place, Summerhill Residents' Association, Mallow Co Cork. dCDP14/1805</p>	<p>This submission states that there is huge pressure on the road network in Mallow (making reference to the proposed extension to Davis College) and requests that the CDP carry out a study into traffic issues in the area and make recommendations based on this study.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to require the carrying out of study into traffic issues in Mallow?</p>	<p>The requirement for such a study would be considered as part of the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required</p>
<p>Thiel, Philippa dCDP14/1736</p>	<p>This submission requests that Rathclaren House, Kilbriain should not be included on the Record of Protected Structures stating that the only original features of the house are the front door and sides of the house.</p>	<p>Should the Draft plan be amended to delete Rathclaren House from the Record of Protected Structures?</p>	<p>The rectory is on the NIAH as a structure of regional importance and is associated with Rathclaren Church which is of national importance. While the interior of the house has been substantially altered, the features and structure of the exterior remain intact. Therefore the plan should be amended to include the exterior only of the house in the RPS.</p>	<p>Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Travers, Robert dCDP14/1714</p>	<p>This submission queries whether the Church of the Ascension, Timoleague (1811) is included on the RPS as it does not appear to be listed. The</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the Church of the Ascension, Timoleague (1811) on the Record of Protected Structures as it does not appear</p>	<p>The church has now been included in the Draft Plan as RPS 01375.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>submission also states that the church contains a unique neo-Byzantine mosaic interior and some of the earliest stained glass by Warrington and is in need of statutory protection. Ref: http://cork.anglican.org/tourists/historical-interest/timoleague-the-maharaja-and-the-church-of-the-mosaics/</p>	<p>to be listed.</p>		
<p>Twomey, Joan dCDP14/1849</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Twomey, Joan dCDP14/1863</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of the scenic routes) in areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Twomey, Joan dCDP14/1898</p>	<p>Wind Energy Developments shall only be allowed in suitable areas pending: 1) Economic and environmental Justification of 'Communal Opportunity Benefits' forfeited, 2) Economic and environmental sustainability, 3) EU Review of Renewable Energy Policies, and 4) National Review of Renewable Energy Policies.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to only allow wind energy developments in suitable areas pending economic justification, environmental justification and sustainability, and a review (EU and National) of renewable energy policies?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Twomey, Joan dCDP14/1899</p>	<p>This submission refers to the Energy Background Paper, November 2010, Page 25 and requests that all turbines in County Cork proposed by a Wind Energy Farm / Development Company (Excluding 'National Planning Exempt turbines'), shall be set back (restricted zone) from any occupied dwelling by the following ratios: turbine height less than 50 metres=750 metres setback; turbine height 50 to 100 metres=1000 metres setback; turbine height 100 to 150 metres=1250 metres setback; etc. The submission proposes that the residents within this restricted setback zone shall exercise a veto on planning permission being granted to proposed Wind Energy Farm/Development unless and until agreement can be reached between resident in occupied dwelling and the proposed Wind Energy</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for different separation distances from any occupied dwelling depending on size and scale of wind turbine?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy" Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	Farm/Development Company.			
<p>Twomey, Liam dCDP14/1813</p>	<p>States the potential for the sustainable Metropolitan Town of Cobh to achieve its population target to 2022 is at risk. States that there remains a need to encourage critical population growth in the Cork Gateway in line with the strategic aim of Metropolitan Cork Towns such as Cobh. There is a need to ensure there is a sufficient amount of zoned residential land, particularly in the Cork Gateway. Requests the CDP look to identify additional land reserves in the Cork Gateway, including the subject lands (Metropolitan Greenbelt)</p>	<p>1. Is the supply of land and population targets identified in the Draft Plan and the respective LAPs sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Map be amended to zone land for development?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>2. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>in Ballywilliam, Cobh, which may be brought forward for development during the lifetime of the Plan in order to facilitate the Council in achieving its population targets for the Gateway. Requests the CDP has regard to the potential of the subject lands to accommodate additional residential development in Cobh in line with policy objective CS 4-1 (j) of the draft Cork County Development Plan 2015-2021.</p>			
<p>Twomey, Siobhan dCDP14/1844</p>	<p>Requests that Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to include Lough Allua, Shehy Mor Mountains and Gougane Barra to be zoned for Wind Energy Development as 'Normally Discouraged'?</p>	<p>A number of key policy considerations including important or High Value Landscapes were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is designated Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and it is considered that objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
<p>Twomey, Siobhan dCDP14/1854</p>	<p>This submission states that areas of County Cork enjoying high scenic amenity value and economic value with regard to Tourism (and the scenic routes used by vehicular traffic to avail of such scenic amenity) should enjoy a designation which precludes development of wind energy within 5km of aforementioned scenic routes. The submission requests Cork County Council to identify and protect scenic routes including areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm / Development and protect potential economic tourist development.</p>	<p>Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify and protect scenic routes (with a designation which precludes development of wind energy) within 5km of the scenic routes in areas such as Shehy Mór, Lough Allua and Gougane Barra from Wind Energy Farm/Development and protect potential economic tourist development?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality of this landscape.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>University College Cork dCDP14/1788</p>	<p>This submission notes that there is strong policy support for the development of the Cork Science and Innovation Park (CSIP) within the County and Local Area Plans and the proposed policies in relation to recreation and amenity policy;</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for the zoning of land for specific purposes including sports facilities in the Metropolitan Green Belt?</p>	<p>1. The issue of the zoning of land is a matter for the next review of the relevant Local Area Plan. Policy Objectives RCI 5-5 and GI 8-1 do not preclude Active and Recreational Uses within Greenbelt Lands</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the Metropolitan Greenbelt; and landscape designation allow, in principle, for the relocation of the sports facility. However, the submission expresses concern that some of the draft CDP policies could be interpreted in a more rigid manner at appeal and may result in delaying or frustrating the strategic objective of developing UCC lands within CSIP. Specifically, the submission raises the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The High Value Landscape designation of the CSIP. 2. The Recreation and Amenity Policy Objectives which apply to the relocation of the sports grounds. 3. The Metropolitan Green Belt Designation of the proposed new sports grounds <p>The submission therefore proposes a number of amendments to the Draft County Plan and also requests that the Carrigaline LAP be varied:</p>	<p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to change the extent of the High Value Landscape designation?</p>	<p>2. The intention of the plan is not to preclude development in High Value Landscapes, but to ensure that considerable care is required in order to successfully locate large scale developments in High Value Landscapes without them becoming unduly obtrusive.</p>	<p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>(a) to include the relocation of the existing sports grounds in the objectives for the X-01 zone, and (b) to designate the site of the proposed new sports grounds for that specific purpose.</p>			
<p>Wallace, Kieran and Swinburne, David dCDP14/1767</p>	<p>This submission concerns the Douglas Developments Ltd. and relates to the policies proposed for Douglas and Douglas Court Shopping Centre. The submission acknowledges the importance for retailing to the county's employment and economic activity and the strategic role of Douglas as an employment location and retail destination. 2) It is also requested that Cork County Council include a specific policy objective to support comparison retailing at Douglas so as to ensure it can regain its appropriate market share, 3) it is also requested that the current and proposed anti competitive mechanism of capping comparison retail development in suburban</p>	<p>1) Should the Draft Plan be amended to acknowledge importance of retailing to the County’s employment and economic activity? 2) Should the Draft Plan acknowledge the strategic role of Douglas as an employment location? 3) Should the Draft Plan introduce specific policy objective to</p>	<p>1) The Draft Plan recognises that the retail sector is a key element of the national economy in terms of employment and economic activity and policies and objectives in relation to retail and town centres are specifically set out in an individual chapter of the plan. 2) The Cork City South Environs located within the Cork Gateway is recognised as a principle location within the employment hierarchy. Douglas is a key location within the South Environs. This importance is recognised in the recently prepared Douglas Land Use and Transportation Plan which advocates an approach which provides employment and other uses in tandem with other infrastructure such as transport. 3) Douglas is recognised as a District Centre within the Retail Strategy. The</p>	<p>1) No Amendment Required 2) No Amendment Required 3) No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>district centres based on the primacy of Mahon Point should be discontinued. 4) It is also requested that the real level of comparison retailing at Mahon be acknowledged in the final Plan. 5) Finally, it is pointed out that there is an inconsistency between Table 7.2 of the Draft Plan and Table 4 of the Draft Retail Strategy that suggests that no further convenience retailing has been allocated for Douglas and that this table is amended to reflect the correct intention of the draft retail strategy.</p>	<p>support comparison retailing at Douglas to ensure it can regain its appropriate market share?</p> <p>4) Should the Draft Plan be amended to end the District Centre capping based on Mahon?</p> <p>5) Should the Draft Plan be amended to clarify table 7.2?</p>	<p>Draft Plan clearly sets out the role of District Centres in TCR4-4. In addition the text of the Joint Retail Strategy states: ‘The priority for Douglas is to reduce the current levels of vacancy and to provide for a modest increase in comparison floorspace to help restore market share.’</p> <p>4) It is considered appropriate to retain the objective regarding restriction of the growth of District Centres beyond the size of Mahon within the Draft Retail Strategy in order to protect the retail primacy of the city centre.</p> <p>5) It is proposed to revise table 7.2 to provide greater clarity.</p>	<p>4) No Amendment Required</p> <p>5) Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Walsh, David dCDP14/1731</p>	<p>This submission requests that lands in Kilmoney, Carrigaline, should be zoned for residential development under the Cork County Development plan. The submission states that the lands are in close proximity to Carrigaline town centre and are currently bordering the residential development "Castleheights" to the north.</p>	<p>1. Is the supply of land identified in the Draft Plan and the respective LAPs sufficient to meet the likely demand for housing over the plan period?</p> <p>2. Can the development boundary for Carrigaline be amended in the County Development Plan?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>2. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Walsh, David dCDP14/1757</p>	<p>This submission requests the removal of the zoning objective labelled X-01 in the LAP at Knockacur, Doneraile. The submission notes that 3 requests for development have now be refused by An Bord Pleanala and states that it is now clear that this land, based solely on the facts laid out by CCC and ABP does not constitute land having</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to remove zoning objective X-01 in Doneraile?</p>	<p>1. This is a matter for the next LAP review.</p>	<p>No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	developmental potential.			
<p>Ward, Malachy dCDP14/1809</p>	<p>This submission does not welcome wind farms in County Cork and outlines the following concerns in relation to wind farms and the adopted development plan;</p> <p>1. It will not protect communities from developers and will cause problems between neighbours.</p> <p>2. Too much of County 'open to consideration' for industrial wind farms.</p> <p>3. Concerned that the "Board" makes the final decision rather than the elected people of the County Council via the development plan.</p> <p>4. The siting of wind turbines near residential properties is a</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that the wind energy deployment areas specifically the areas Open to Consideration are reduced in size?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider the concerns outlined in relation to the environmental impacts of large wind turbines including noise and proximity to residential properties in the absence of revised wind guidelines.</p> <p>3. Should the Draft Plan be amended to consider public consultation?</p> <p>4. Requests a Cost Benefits</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "On-shore Wind Energy"</p> <p>The current approach facilitates large scale commercial wind energy development in approximately 55% of Cork County with the remaining 45% unlikely to be suitable.</p> <p>2. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>3. It is considered that the Planning Acts in relation to development management and plan making make sufficient provision for public consultation.</p> <p>4. It is considered that this is not a matter</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>concern and a distance of 2km is certainly too close to an industrial turbine and 2km distance at least required.</p> <p>5. Consultation is required with local communities rather than the developer secretly bribing local farmers to participate in their plans at the local people's expense. States that locals were not told of the turbines being planned for the area which has caused anger at the developer and neighbours.</p> <p>6. Noise is another concern that must be dealt with in the proper way.</p> <p>7. Requests a Cost Benefits Analysis for wind turbines in Co Cork to show a clear picture of claims made by the companies of incorrect high power outputs from wind farms.</p>	<p>Analysis for wind turbines in Co. Cork to show a clear picture of claims made by the companies of incorrect high power outputs from wind farms.</p>	<p>for the County Development Plan review.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Working Group on Services and Infrastructure for an Ageing Population dCDP14/1773</p>	<p>Working Group submission highlights a range of issues relevant to the planning and provision of services and infrastructure for an ageing population in the greater Cork area. Welcomes the inclusion of a specific section on the needs of older people. Recommends that the Plan should be ‘age-proofed’ to ensure that its contents that directly or indirectly impact older people support the objective of positive ageing of older people across the county in their own homes and communities for as long as is feasible. Working Group is of the view that macro-level policies need to be evaluated for their potential impact on older people, for example land zoning policies (including planning for the location of commercial & industrial sites, services and employment creation) should support younger people to remain in their local communities to maintain a</p>	<p>1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow for integrated planning at senior management level between local authorities, health sector, and garda, transport authorities, utility providers etc to ensure that healthy ageing in place is achieved?</p> <p>2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the importance of accurate and comprehensive evidence base to facilitate effective planning for the future needs of the population and thus encourage the compilation of up to date on an ongoing basis?</p> <p>3. The Working Group welcomes the inclusion of a specific section on the needs of older people.</p> <p>4. Should the Draft Plan be ‘age-proofed’ to ensure that its contents that directly or indirectly impact older people support the objective of positive ageing of</p>	<p>1. and 6. As part of the Age Friendly County Programme which Cork County Council is likely to commence the programme includes the setting up of an ‘Alliance’ at senior management level to integrate services for older persons. It is expected that the outcomes of this will address these matters including the need for integrated planning.</p> <p>2. As part of the Services and Infrastructure For Older Persons Strategy data is being gathered and mapped relating to services for older persons.</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. In relation to age proofing the National Positive Ageing Strategy suggests following UN Principles which it says should guide any actions developed to progress Ireland towards an age-</p>	<p>1. No Amendment Required</p> <p>2. No Amendment Required</p> <p>3. No Amendment Required</p> <p>4. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>healthy balance between age groups especially in areas prone to depopulation, and the Draft Plan should recognise the negative impact of the outward migration of younger people in search of employment on older people and on family and community support networks. Finally, the submission also identifies a number of specific concerns which relate to housing and accommodation planning; provision and design; personal and community safety; transport and mobility; socialisation and social inclusion; connectivity, information technology and knowledge identifying areas where the draft plan and identifies policies to make them more 'age friendly'.</p>	<p>older people.</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that macro-level policies can be evaluated for their potential impact on older people, for example land zoning policies (including planning for the location of commercial & industrial sites, services and employment creation) should support younger people to remain in their local communities to maintain a healthy balance between age groups especially in areas prone to depopulation.</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to take specific</p>	<p>friendly society and can serve as a useful age-proofing tool for policy development and service delivery purposes, i.e. they should be used to assess the age-friendliness of policies, programmes and services for older people. It may not be possible to age proof the Draft plan in view of the procedure and time scales however, going forward the Council will endeavour to age proof all statutory and non-statutory plans.</p> <p>5. One of the aims of Chapter 6: is to 'encourage and facilitate optimal levels of sustainable economic development to meet the existing and future employment needs of County Cork by fostering competitiveness and innovation in all sectors within a high quality physical environment, utilising best practice and contemporary thinking on economic development'.</p> <p>6. The Draft Plan has where possible taken account of the specific</p>	<p>5. No Amendment Required</p> <p>6. No Amendment Required</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>concerns into account regarding housing accommodation and planning, provision and design, personal and community safety, transport and mobility, socialisation and social inclusion, connectivity and information technology?</p>	<p>requirements of an ageing population in formulating the policies and objectives.</p>	
<p>Xiu Lan Hotels Ltd. dCDP14/1827</p>	<p>Submission is concerned that the provisions of the Draft CDP may not be sufficiently supportive of the proposed future development and enhancement of Fota Island Resort, in particular the reference to 'special circumstances' in RCI 5-6. Requests that a specific reference to Fota be inserted in the plan citing the desirability of added tourism, sports and leisure amenities at the resort together with suitable supporting facilities, in order to establish the location as a recognised international tourism, sports and leisure destination. Submission proposes text for a new objective. Submission states</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Draft Plan be amended to be supportive of the future development and enhancement of Fota Island Resort? 2. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that it is sufficiently supportive of the proposed future tourism, sports and leisure amenities development and enhancement of Fota Island Resort as an international tourism, sports and leisure destination as well as a significant economic asset for the Cork Metropolitan Region? 3. Future developments planned in the Fota Island resort will require significant capital investment, some of which could 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fota Wildlife Park is acknowledged as a key tourist attraction in section 8.3.2 of the Draft CDP and Cork Harbour as a nationally significant tourist asset. 2. See No. 1 above 3. This is a matter for Development Management. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Amendment Required 2. No Amendment Required 3. No Amendment Required

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>that Fota Island should be seen as a significant economic asset for the Cork Metropolitan Region, and that all reasonable development should be actively encouraged. Submission outlines key future developments planned in the resort and states that these will require significant capital investment, some of which could be realised through a relaxation of occupancy restrictions for a number of future holiday homes in the resort.</p>	<p>be realised through a relaxation of occupancy restrictions for a number of future holiday homes in the resort.</p>		

Section 2(b) Chief Executive’s Response to the Planning SPC Submission

The following comments are from the Planning SPC members outlining the main areas of the draft plan which are supported and where some amendments may be made. They are set out by chapter title as per Volume One of the Draft Plan.

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
Introduction	<p>Welcome the new dedicated Web-site for the draft CDP http://www.corkcocodevplan.com/ and acknowledge its advantages as a public viewing tool and the added Value for Money it has generated not only in terms of its cost saving in printing and man power terms but also maintaining the amount of online submissions received which also has added cost benefits.</p> <p>Welcome the production of the web-browser as an alternative method of viewing the draft plan maps and acknowledge the importance of the interdepartmental cooperation with ICT Department.</p>	<p>1. Welcome the new dedicated Web-site for the draft CDP and</p> <p>2. The production of the web-browser.</p>	1 and 2. Noted	1 and 2. No Amendment Required
Core Strategy	<p>Recognise the realignment of the population distribution in the Metropolitan Cork and Greater Cork Ring areas.</p> <p>Support recognition that the vision of the plan set out in the core strategy can only be delivered if all the infrastructure providers work together, Government Departments, NRA, NTA</p>	<p>3. Recognise the realignment of the population distribution in the Metropolitan Cork and Greater Cork Ring areas.</p>	3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”	3 -5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>and IW to achieve that vision.</p> <p>There are a number of policy areas where collaboration and co-ordinated development with stakeholders outside of the County Council is required to ensure the implementation of the best possible responses and we believe it is imperative that these are specified within the plan to ensure solid operational foundations are put in place from the outset. The Plan should clearly identify and establish, as part of the implementation framework, processes for ongoing engagement with key stakeholders external to the County Council on planning matters across key sectoral areas (e.g. tourism; economy; telecommunications) to ensure a co-ordinated and comprehensive approach to development. Applies also to Chapter 15.</p> <p>Joint City/County Council Strategies on key policy areas including tourism, international telecommunications connectivity and strategic marketing should be developed to optimise regional gains on cross- cutting strategic planning matters. Such an approach is all the more imperative now in light of the increasing Government onus on shared, co-ordinated ‘whole region’ responses to local strategic development and planning. Applies also to Chapter 15.</p>	<p>4. Recognise Core strategy can only be delivered if all the infrastructure providers work together.</p> <p>5. Should the Draft Plan be amended to clearly identify and establish, as part of the implementation framework, processes for ongoing engagement with key stakeholders external to the County Council on planning matters across key sectoral areas?</p> <p>6. Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage Joint City/County Council Strategies on key policy areas to be developed?</p>	<p>4. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>6. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>	<p>6 -10. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>The County Development Plan (CDP) should set a clear policy to continue to monitor how population and economic growth trends are being addressed within the strategic planning areas of both the City and the County and seek adjustments if necessary to ensure timely and proactive responses that enables the County to meet public and commercial needs in a way that aligns with the overarching Vision of the CDP Plan This structure should include all of the stakeholders outside of Cork County Council. Applies also to Chapter 15.</p> <p>The CDP should give a commitment to zone additional lands within key settlements in Metropolitan Cork, where there is a lack of ‘headroom’ in residential zonings. The following settlements have little, or no, ‘headroom’ – Glanmire; Cork South Environs; Carrigaline; Passage West; Midleton; Carrigtwohill and Cobh. The total headroom in Metropolitan Cork is 5,582 units – and over 3,000 of this ‘capacity’ are located in Monard, which is constrained by the lack of a planning framework. The global figures for Metropolitan Cork mask an underlying lack of capacity in key settlements where the residential market will recover fastest.</p> <p>Given the development constraints on Cork</p>	<p>7. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include proposals to monitor how population and economic growth trends are being addressed within the strategic planning areas of both the City and the County and seek adjustments if necessary?</p> <p>8. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a commitment to zone additional lands within key settlements in Metropolitan Cork, where there is a lack of ‘headroom’ in residential zonings?</p> <p>9. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that there is adequate zoning and infrastructure provision to meet future requirements, in the areas of Metropolitan Cork where there is market demand?</p> <p>10. Should the Core Strategy be amended to help deliver the</p>	<p>7. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)“Core Strategy” A ”Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>8. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A ”Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>9. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A ”Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p> <p>10. See Volume 1, Section 1(b)</p>	

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>City, residential demand will be focused on Metropolitan Cork. It is vital that priority in ensuring adequate zoning and infrastructure provision is given to the areas in Metropolitan Cork where there is market demand. The CDP should give a commitment to reviewing zoning within the forthcoming LAP reviews, taking account of market requirements.</p> <p>Should find ways to prioritise the delivery of services in Ballincollig and Ballyvolane in order to bring forward development of these areas in the short-term.</p>	<p>water services and transport infrastructure required and prioritise key settlements?</p>	<p>"Core Strategy" A "Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs"</p>	
Housing	<p>Fully support a new more flexible approach to the application of housing density standards so that all housing types can be accommodated on zoned lands within the main settlements which would allow for more housing to be accommodated on zoned land.</p> <p>Reduced housing densities may help to reduce pressure for urban generated rural housing but more needs to be done. The CDP should comply with the requirement of the Minister's Guidelines 2.2.2 that the planning authority should respond to pressure for urban generated housing in rural areas by examining the reasons why the populations of towns and cities are not growing and seeking to overcome</p>	<p>11. Support a new more flexible approach to the application of housing density standards.</p> <p>12. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that while the new approach to housing densities may help, the reasons why the populations of towns and cities are not growing and seeking to overcome the barriers to development in urban areas should be investigated?</p>	<p>11. Noted.</p> <p>12. It is intended that the new housing density standards in the Draft Plan which provide for a more flexible approach, therefore attracting a wider range of house types will make towns more attractive. Also it is intended that the next</p>	<p>11. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>12. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>the barriers to development in urban areas. The fundamental weakness in the settlement strategy is that it penalizes rural communities for the failure to achieve urban population targets.</p> <p>That some low density suburban housing choice / mix to include serviced sites or housing schemes in towns and villages of appropriate scale and character in particular but not exclusively outside of Metropolitan Cork be made available. This might include small amount of “parkland type development” with very large sites with “room for pony” in the more rural towns/villages. This will enhance the desirability of such places and help reduce the urban generated rural housing demand. The proposal is in line with Ministerial Guidelines 2005, 2.3.</p> <p>That an analysis of rural villages/towns be carried out to determine the good and detracting factors and that a guide/plan should be drawn up to help eliminate/reduce the detracting qualities and remedy by designing in better elements to give the area more enduring quality and character. Larger garden size should generally be achieved in the rural towns / villages. This approach will in turn allow for smaller higher density schemes to be</p>	<p>13. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide additional guidance about the scale and type of growth that would be appropriate in villages?</p> <p>14. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow further consideration of the priority lists for infrastructure provision?</p>	<p>Local Area Plan review will include an increased emphasis and detailed analysis of the main settlements in the county including consideration of what changes are required to make them more attractive places to live and work in.</p> <p>13. Additional guidance on issues to be addressed in the next Local Area Plan Review will be provided.</p> <p>14. Work is ongoing in addressing the key issue of prioritising the delivery of the necessary infrastructure and Chapters 11 and 15 of the Draft Plan will be amended to address this issue.</p>	<p>13. Amendment Required.</p> <p>14. Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>integrated and give a more balanced stable population with the ability to trade up or down as needed.</p> <p>That Ballyvolane master plan and infrastructure be prioritised to short term rather than medium to long term as in the draft. Reality may demand the design of infrastructure corridors and access points as distinct from full master plan.</p> <p>As the Government no longer sees a need for subvented affordable housing, all Part V housing will be for social housing needs. The requirement for Part V housing should reflect the actual demand for social housing (which is a maximum of 8%, rather than 14%). In reality the Part V percentage for social housing has increased from 10% to 14%.</p> <p>The CDP should set a policy to review the Recreation and Amenity policy, based on detailed evaluation of implementation to date, the needs and preferences of residents and the impact of the policy on house prices for new build developments.</p>	<p>15. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a provision for Part V social housing from 14% to 8%?</p> <p>16. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a commitment to review the Recreation and Amenity policy?</p>	<p>15. The Part V requirement of 14% for social and specialised housing requirement as set out in the plan is based on the best available information and the Department of Environment methodology it is expected that this will be reviewed in the coming year and when the corresponding legislative measures are put in place the County and City Council will take appropriate action as required. The options for the discharge of Part V are taken from Circular 11 /2012.</p> <p>16. During the lifetime of the plan consideration will be given to reviewing the Recreation and Amenity policy.</p>	<p>15. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>16. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Rural Coastal and Islands</p>	<p>Support the revised rural housing policies which set out in a positive manner to better manage rural housing across the entire county by clearly identifying genuine rural housing need categories, those groups of people that we wish to encourage to live in the countryside and facilitate them were possible across each of the rural housing policy area types identified.</p> <p>Rural Housing Policy Area Types have the immediate effect of denying all but those who have never previously owned a house/home the right to build in 80% of the county and then only are they allowed under excessively draconian rules even in what can only be described as very remote areas.</p> <p>Concerned with the extension of the “area under strong urban influence” to stretch out to the north of Fermoy and Mallow together with remote areas of both east and west of Macroom which will further disadvantage these areas. Given the rate of emigration in recent years there is no justification for imposing new restrictions on some areas.</p> <p>That the boundary of the “Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence” be restricted to what was previously defined as the Rural Housing Control Zone. Reasons: The Rural Housing</p>	<p>17. Support the revised rural housing policies which set out in a positive manner to better manage rural housing across the entire County.</p> <p>18. Should the Draft Plan categories of Rural Generated Housing Need be amended?</p> <p>19. Should the Draft Plan Rural Housing Policy Area Types Map be amended?</p> <p>20. Should the Draft Plan be amended to change the definition of local rural area which is far too narrow?</p>	<p>17. Noted. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>18. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>19. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>20. The definition of local rural area is based on the current County Development Plan and is in compliance with the Sustainable Rural Housing Ministerial Guidelines 2005.</p>	<p>17. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>18. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>19. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>20. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>Control Zone for example included areas such as Aghabullogue; Bealnamorive, north of Carrigadrohid; Carrignavar to edge of Glenville; Bartlemy; Leamlara; Knockraha; Castlemartyr; Crossbarry; Nohovel; Dunderrow much of which could not be described as being under urban generated pressures.</p> <p>The new proposed “Rural area under strong urban influence” includes for example Carriganimmy; Clondrohid; Kilcolman, Kilbrittain; Garretstown etc which under no circumstances can be classed as being under STRONG urban influence.</p> <p>The new policy for rural housing does not comply with the Ministers Planning Guidelines 2005 in the following respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Minister intended that the rural areas under strong rural influence should only be identified in the immediate environs and close commuting catchment of the cities and large towns (5,000 pop) ▪ The designation of areas outside the Rural 	<p>21. Should the Draft Plan be amended so that restrictions on the renovation or replacement of derelict dwellings which are unnecessary and onerous are changed?</p> <p>22. Should the Draft Plan be amended to take established patterns of development in rural areas into account?</p> <p>23. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise Para 4.5.13 to allow the development of some low density suburban choice / mix to include serviced sites or housing schemes in towns and villages.</p>	<p>21. The policy set out in RCI 7-4 sets out to positively encourage the refurbishment of existing disused and derelict dwellings.</p> <p>22. Section 4.6.7 to 4.6.8 and RCI 6-3 set out clearly how any proposal will be assessed with regard to ribbon development. The pattern of development in rural area is a general planning consideration as set out in Section 4.6.</p> <p>23. This policy refers to GB 1-2 areas which are delineated on the Town Green Belt maps contained in the LAPs and are intended for a limited number of individual dwellings only. It would not be appropriate to permit multiple housing developments in such areas; these developments</p>	<p>21. Amendment Required.</p> <p>22. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>23. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Housing Control zone as under STRONG URBAN INFLUENCE does not reflect the reality of rural Cork. Indeed areas such as the remote area between Macroom and Millstreet and the Muskerry Gaeltacht areas should be more correctly defined as being structurally weak as is the western part of Duhallow. As indicated on pg 6 of the Ministers guidelines areas at risk of losing population necessary to sustain essential services such as schools, local shops, sporting clubs need population generation.</p> <p>■</p> <p>People who are part of the rural community should be facilitated in all rural areas. Concerned those applicants in the Metropolitan Green Belt must now satisfy an exceptional housing need. The Draft Plan also introduces</p>	<p>24. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise that the lack of suitable alternatives is a major factor in urban generated rural housing?</p> <p>25. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make provision for second/holiday homes in rural areas?</p>	<p>should be located within the extensive settlement network.</p> <p>24. The revised housing density standards which will allow for a more flexible approach to housing provision within settlements will help to reduce the demand for urban generated rural housing. The next LAP Review will consider what additional measures can be taken to make towns and villages more attractive places to live.</p> <p>25. The Sustainable Rural Housing Ministerial Guidelines 2005 place a clear emphasis on the importance of meeting the rural generated housing needs of rural communities. Holiday homes and second homes are generally urban generated and are not</p>	<p>24. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>25. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>more restrictive qualifying criteria. These undermine the fundamental first principle of the Ministers Guidelines, Ref; Introduction, pg 1, first bullet point: “People who are part of the rural community should be facilitated by the planning system in all rural areas, INCLUDING THOSE UNDER STRONG URBAN-BASED PRESSURES.”</p> <p>Applicants in the Metropolitan Greenbelt must now satisfy the Planning authority that their housing need is exceptional, Ref RCI 5-2 (b). This will make it nigh impossible to meet the Ministerial Guidelines as expressed in the previous paragraph. RCI 5-4 also undermines the ministerial Guidelines.</p> <p>Farmers and their sons and daughters may only build on their farm if it is their first owner occupied home.</p> <p>The 2 dwellings per landholding quota do not take account of family size or the development potential of the landholdings. The imposition of a quota of 2 houses per family farm/ single holding “could preclude other family members being accommodated on the family farm” ref 3.2.3 pg 23 Planning Guidelines, 3rd paragraph. It could also be used retrospectively on landholdings where already two permissions</p>	<p>26. Should the Draft Plan include text stating “Sufficient development will be facilitated to sustain and renew a vibrant community and its social infrastructure to local circumstances”</p> <p>27. Population decline should be a consideration in rural areas.</p>	<p>required to meet the housing needs of rural communities. The Guidelines encourage holiday/second homes to locate within the existing settlement network.</p> <p>26. The Sustainable Rural Housing Ministerial Guidelines 2005 emphasise the importance of maintaining sustainable rural communities, and this is reiterated in the Draft Plan policy. However further additional text will be included.</p> <p>27. Persistent population decline was a key consideration in identifying the Rural Housing Policy Area Types. The approach taken is clearly set out in the document “Rural Housing Background Paper, November 2012”.</p>	<p>26. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). “Rural Coastal and Islands”</p> <p>27. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>had been received at the time the new plan was adopted.</p> <p>Provision should be made for part time occupations where the predominant occupation is farming/natural resource related. This should apply to all rural area types as per Ministerial Guidelines pg 24.</p> <p>The provision for people working in essential social and community services is confined to only some areas and is restricted to those who have permanent jobs but have not previously owned a home.</p> <p>Where families are living within a town boundary and have land outside the town that their families are precluded from building on the land</p> <p>Consider the carrying out of a study of the policy in the Beara Peninsula and effects of the policy on population trends.</p> <p>Include a force majeure provision.</p> <p>Definition of local rural area is far too narrow. Ministerial Guidelines 2005 Pg 42. 4.9 "It is vitally important that these guidelines are implemented quickly and fairly to ensure</p>			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>planning policies recognise the importance to rural people of family ties and ties to a local area such as a parish or townland or the catchment of local schools and sporting clubs and deliver positive benefits for rural areas and sustain rural communities by allowing people to build in their local areas on suitable sites.”</p> <p>Restrictions on the renovation or replacement of derelict dwellings are unnecessary and onerous. The approach should be more in line with pg 22. Bullet point 3 throughout the county.</p> <p>Draft plan with regard to housing density and ribboning does take on board established patterns of existing development.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.13 Amend to allow the development of some low density suburban choice / mix to include serviced sites or housing schemes in towns and villages of appropriate scale and character outside of Metropolitan Cork. This will enhance the desirability of such places and help reduce the urban generated rural housing demand. The proposal is in line with Ministerial Guidelines 2005, 2.3.</p> <p>Urban generated rural housing is largely generated by a lack of suitable alternatives in</p>			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>the towns.</p> <p>Second home requirement that is not holiday home but meets a requisite need: Example given is a mother living in a west Cork town who had a family member with a disability i.e. son /daughter who was living in a different part of west cork and the mother wanted to build a second house near her son so that she could stay and help him for part of the week but this wasn't allowed as she had a house within a development boundary.</p> <p>Include text stating "Sufficient development will be facilitated to sustain and renew a vibrant community and its social infrastructure to local circumstances" and "Persons who can demonstrate an economic and social need to live in the local rural area where they work, within which it is proposed to, build".</p> <p>Population decline should be a consideration in formulating rural housing policy.</p>			
Social and Community	Recognition in the plan of the need to carefully consider the future planning needs for Healthcare Provision and Planning for Ageing.	28. Consider the future planning needs for Healthcare Provision and Planning for Ageing.	28. Noted. Additional text to improve planning for the aged will be included.	28. Amendment Required.

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Supports the concept of Multi-use community facilities, the plan's proposals on childcare and education facilities.</p> <p>Supports the concepts of 'Planning for Ageing' and the aim to make Cork an age friendly county recognising the demographic challenges that face the county and ensuring the provision of suitable facilities and services in the future.</p> <p>The concept of the 50 acre park sports complex idea as included in the Ballyvolane LAP should be further developed to have schools constructed on the periphery of same to facilitate school use of the sports grounds. Proper design could aid the duplicate use of community and school halls together with sharing of tar macadam parking areas. This concept should be used in all new large master plan areas.</p>	<p>29. Should the Draft Plan be amended to encourage the sharing of educational/community facilities?</p> <p>30. Should the Draft Plan be amended to further support the concept of "Planning for Ageing"</p>	<p>29. Chapter 5, Section 5.2 and Objective SC 2-1 encourage the provision of shared facilities.</p> <p>30. Noted. Additional text to improve planning for the aged will be included.</p>	<p>29. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>30. Amendment Required.</p>
Economy and Employment	<p>Support the principles of the overall strategy for economic development – however also acknowledges that there needs to be further linkages with other ongoing local and strategic economic initiatives currently being undertaken in the county.</p>	<p>31. Should the Draft Plan be amended to further strengthen linkages with other ongoing local and strategic economic initiatives currently being undertaken in the County?</p>	<p>31. It is considered that the Draft Plan already provides good linkages to other initiatives.</p>	<p>31. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>Importance of flexibility in the statutory planning frameworks to respond to economic opportunities within indigenous industries and new foreign direct investments as they arise.</p> <p>The ‘Economy and Employment’ chapter should be underpinned by a current and relevant Economic Development Strategy with particular reference to the modern day needs of the key knowledge-economy industry sectors, indigenous companies and key growth sectors across the County.</p> <p>The Economic Development Strategy should incorporate assessment and associated provisions to ensure optimal infrastructure and supports across the business landscape from entrepreneurs, micro-enterprises, start-ups and SMEs to large scale indigenous and MNCs to ensure a strong foundational strategy that enables planning to align with key requirements of the regional economy.</p> <p>Needs assessments of key growth sectors (e.g. consistently escalating opportunities within agri-food and the blue growth economy) should also be incorporated to ensure the region is prime positioned to capitalise on key related economic opportunities.</p>	<p>32. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include provision for the preparation of an Economic Development Strategy with particular reference to the modern day needs of the key knowledge-economy industry sectors, indigenous companies (agri-food and blue growth) and other key growth sectors?</p> <p>33. Should the Draft Plan be amended to prioritise the delivery of the key services infrastructure required for employment lands?</p> <p>34. Should the Draft Plan set out guidance on how best to provide the types of sites/services required in order to attract foreign direct investment and insure that there is an adequate supply of employment lands available.</p>	<p>32. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p> <p>33. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p> <p>34. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p>	<p>32. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p> <p>33. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p> <p>34. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Economy and Employment”</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>By preparing an Economic Development Strategy for industrial development and key growth opportunity requirements, where the County assesses modern day needs of the key knowledge-economy sectors against the level of services currently available at the Strategic Employment Areas (see diagram below), the Council is prime positioned to form a sound basis for seeking funding for priority projects, in line with government initiatives for job creation.</p> <p>Existing deficiencies in land zoned for industry must be addressed (e.g. Ringaskiddy –N28 road access; CSIP N40 road access; Carrigtwohill & Ringaskiddy – wastewater treatment) to ensure the availability of ‘ready to go’ sites and property solutions that do not require significant lead in times for the delivery of necessary utility and access infrastructure for manufacturing/commercial infrastructure. The Plan should recognise the importance of providing a choice of quality products in quality locations”</p> <p>Foreign Direct Investment: The CDP needs to recognise the need for quality serviced land for FDI in support of the key Government Jobs Strategy. Reflecting the urgent National and local importance of job generation and knowing</p>	<p>35. Should the Draft Plan be amended to make provision for the planned expansion of existing business parks and the development of new business parks?</p> <p>36. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow the range of uses permissible in lands zoned for enterprise to be expanded?</p>	<p>35. The next LAP Review will consider the land requirements for existing business parks and the development of new business parks.</p> <p>36. Enterprise development requires the highest development standards and tends to locate where there is good access to skilled labour and a variety of modes of transport. Such strategic sites need to be protected from inappropriate uses which are more suitably located on lands zoned for business or industry.</p>	<p>35. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>36. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>the winning formula as described below together with the long lead in time to delivery of a facility; a part 8 planning amendment should be seriously considered. Government support should be sought.</p> <p>The CDP needs to recognise that Cork competes with other European cities for these significant job generating facilities and the plan must thus provide for the very best quality solutions bearing in mind the critical criteria outlined. A compromised solution is pointless, only premier class solutions will win the day.</p> <p>In Cork, 90% of new/large employment is FDI sourced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical Shortage of ‘Grade A’ product – for FDI need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eastgate/Dunkettle – 95% complete + NRA traffic issues. -City Gate Mahon – 100% complete + NRA traffic issues for new development - Airport – 95% complete. - Learn the FDI lesson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Quality building + large 			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>floor plates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Readily available (within 6 months) -Direct connectivity to Motorway Style Road, Public transport, Airport, Shops, Hotel -Ideally seeking cluster opportunity with already established FDI Multi-National Employers -Dynamic ownership [p model with rapid decision making. <p>- Priority/Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only seek to offer the best solution- there is no scope for compromise. 2. The quality variables are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vocational quality - Building Quality - Business model quality 3. Optimum success will be achieved if you offer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Scale (large floor plates) - Scale (for future expansion) - Scale for synergy/clustering of 			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>FDI style uses.</p> <p>4. Quality staff Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Car Parking -Public Transport - Restaurant /Shops - Hotel <p>DON’T OFFER A COMPROMISE SOLUTION – SEEK ONLY A QUALITY BEST SOLUTION</p> <p>The Plan should also identify:</p> <p>-Appropriate opportunities to enable the expansion of successful business parks and new business parks of a similar scale as a priority as many of the business parks across the County are nearing capacity. Expansions/developments should be within easy reach of major transport nodes to ensure the County does not lose out on indigenous and FDI investment opportunities.</p> <p>-Strategically located well-serviced sites for industrial / business uses; focused on those locations closest to major public, private, port and air transport nodes, including Cork Airport Business Park, Ballincollig, Little Island, Carrigtwohill, Middleton and Ringaskiddy. Consideration must also be given to identifying and planning for business/industrial job</p>			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>opportunities in Ballyvolane and the Northern city environs.</p> <p>-Delivery of North Ring Road must be prioritised.</p> <p>-The range of uses permissible in lands zoned for enterprise need to be addressed (currently the zoning objective permits employment uses that are inappropriate to town centres such as office-based industry and business parks. Non-retail general offices are currently discouraged, unless, on a case-by-case basis, it can be demonstrated that suitable premises or sites are not available in the city/town centres. It is considered that this zoning objective should be expanded to include general office uses: the combination of small issues and high car parking requirements inhibits third generation office developments in town centres. If the County is to develop and grow, a relaxation of this policy will be required). The permitted uses for enterprise areas in the County should be focused on supporting employment generating uses, subject to normal planning considerations. Planning policies need to be informed by market forces to a certain degree.</p>			

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
Town Centres and Retail	<p>Acknowledge and further develop the role of town centres in particular their key role and the main centres for retail development.</p> <p>Support the plans proposals regarding Vacancy and regeneration – including the aim to reduce the amount of vacant floor space within core retail areas by 50% in the short term, half of which should be occupied by retail use and the remainder by non-retail uses or retail services.</p> <p>Proposal to establish a fund for town centre renewal projects including car parking.</p>	<p>37. Support Draft Plan policies to further develop the role of town centres.</p> <p>38. Support the Draft Plan policies to reduce vacancy in the town centres.</p> <p>39. Support the Draft Plan policy to establish a town centre renewal fund.</p>	<p>37. Noted.</p> <p>38. Noted.</p> <p>39. Noted</p>	<p>37. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>38. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>39. No Amendment Required.</p>
Tourism	<p>Support and welcome the dedicated chapter on tourism development in the county including the promotion of sustainable tourism in County Cork and the identification of the principle attractions on a 'Key Tourism Assets' map for the county.</p> <p>Include a commitment to develop a 'joint regional tourism strategy' with Cork City Council to properly augment and better promote Cork as a 'one-stop' tourism destination with a diverse range of tourism products all available within one region.</p> <p>Prime tourist destinations within the County should be specially designated for tourism</p>	<p>40. Support and welcome the dedicated chapter on tourism.</p> <p>41. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include a commitment to develop a 'joint regional tourism strategy' with Cork City Council?</p> <p>42. Should the Draft Plan be</p>	<p>40. Noted.</p> <p>41. It proposed to develop a Tourism and Development Marketing Strategy during the lifetime of the plan. It should also be noted that a joint tourism promotion initiative Cork INC has recently been launched.</p> <p>42. The Draft Plan</p>	<p>40. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>41. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>42. No Amendment</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>development and supported accordingly to facilitate further tourism traffic growth through provisions such as enhanced tourism retail developments (e.g. Blarney, Spike Island, and Midleton).</p> <p>Plan should recognise the tourism potential of the Wild Atlantic Way.</p>	<p>amended to ensure that Prime tourist destinations within the County are specially designated for tourism development?</p> <p>43. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the tourism potential of the Wild Atlantic Way?</p>	<p>identifies principle tourism attractions in the county and sets out policies to protect them and allow for complimentary development where appropriate.</p> <p>43. Section 8.1.10 recognises the Wild Atlantic Way as a tourism initiative.</p>	<p>Required.</p> <p>43. No Amendment Required.</p>
<p>Energy and Digital Infrastructure</p>	<p>Recognise the increasing importance of Energy and in particular Renewable Energy in the future development of the state and the region with particular emphasis on a new Onshore Wind Energy policy that provides a clear policy framework for the future development on the wind energy sector in the county.</p> <p>Recognise the need for greater emphasis on the Digital Economy and the requirement to provide proper high speed broadband across the entire county. Also recognition of the importance for the economy and future investment potential of the Gateway in particular to have a direct connection on the south coast to international broadband links.</p>	<p>44. Recognise the increasing importance of Energy and in particular Renewable Energy in the future development.</p> <p>45. Recognise the need for greater emphasis on the Digital Economy and the requirement to provide proper high speed broadband across the entire County.</p> <p>46. Should the Draft Plan be amended to revise the ‘normally discouraged’ area that is proposed for the Whitegate Area</p>	<p>44. Noted.</p> <p>45. Noted.</p> <p>46. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p>	<p>44. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>45. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>46. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “On-shore Wind Energy”</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>In order to safeguard the strategic role and function of the Whitegate area as the National Energy Hub in accordance with policy ED 1-3, it is recommended that Cork County Council revise the ‘normally discouraged’ area that is proposed to an ‘open for consideration’ area for wind energy.</p> <p>The CDP should commit to strategic planning which: supports connectivity to subsea active fibre to enable international Tier 1 connectivity across the Atlantic Gateway regions; the establishment of a data centre; and planning specifications regarding fibre access to buildings and industrial/housing developments.</p>	<p>to an ‘open for consideration’ area for wind energy?</p> <p>47. Should the Draft Plan be amended to provide stronger support for undersea fibre optic connectivity?</p>	<p>47. The Draft Plan supports the provision of such connectivity in Chapter 9, Section 9.7.</p>	<p>47. No Amendment Required.</p>
Transport and Mobility	<p>Support for the approach to public transport (bus and rail) particularly in the Gateway, which will encourage modal shift away from the private car.</p> <p>Also supports the importance for the region of delivering key roads infrastructure such as the N28, Dunkettle Interchange Upgrade, Cork Northern Ring Road, M20 and N25.</p> <p>Support for the new approach to car parking standards generally and how they will be applied in town centre areas.</p>	<p>48. Support for the approach to public transport.</p> <p>49. Supports the importance for the region of delivering key roads infrastructure.</p> <p>50. Support for the new approach to car parking.</p>	<p>48. Noted.</p> <p>49. Noted.</p> <p>50. Noted.</p>	<p>48. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>49. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>50. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>It is vital that the planning authority identify strong policies that ensure the effective delivery of public transport in the County through both private and public sector provision.</p> <p>Supports the establishment of a task force to promote more widespread provision of public transportation within the County and submits that the Chamber represent the views of the business community on this task force.</p> <p>The Plan should commit to the development of clear engagement structures with key cross-county partners along the Atlantic Gateway Corridor to augment support for the progression of the M20 Upgrade.</p> <p>The N28 and N40 need to be considered in tandem if we are to have a network-wide approach in the region which ensures an integrated transport management strategy that all relevant stakeholders are signed up to. Upgrades to both roads and the Dunkettle Interchange are vital to support the requirements of an extensive range of existing businesses and potential new investment opportunities and both should accordingly secure priority status in the CDP.</p>	<p>51. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure delivery of public transport infrastructure?</p> <p>52. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include the establishment of a task force to deliver key infrastructure.</p>	<p>51. The Draft Plan in Chapter 10 sets out clearly the public transport infrastructure required and the importance of delivering such infrastructure.</p> <p>52. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs.</p>	<p>51. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>52. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs”</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	<p>The CDP should incorporate proposals to support the Government’s target that 10% of Ireland’s vehicles be electric by 2020 by facilitating the roll out of charging infrastructure for electric vehicles.</p> <p>Given that the port-related areas at Ringaskiddy and Marino Points are comprised of reclaimed land which has an established industrial character, we ask that the lands intended for future port redevelopment be excluded from the ‘high value landscapes’.</p> <p>Support the development of the M20 – not developing this link with Limerick is a lost opportunity for Cork.</p> <p>We need to protect existing assets – maintaining and repairing the existing road network.</p> <p>Consider the setting up of a structure whereby the Chairs of the Transport and Planning Policy SPCs would meet to co-ordinate policy on maintaining the existing road network.</p>	<p>53. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the N28 and N40 are considered in tandem?</p> <p>54. Should the Draft Plan be amended to better support an increase in the number of electric vehicles?</p> <p>55. Should the Draft Plan be amended to exclude Ringaskiddy and Marino Point from the “High Value Landscape” designation?</p>	<p>53. The Draft Plan highlights the importance of these roads to the development of the County. The sequence of development of these road developments is a matter for the NRA.</p> <p>54. The Draft Plan supports the expansion of electric car use by making provision for parking facilities with charge points in all non residential developments.</p> <p>55. The intention of the plan is not to preclude development in High Value Landscapes, but to ensure that considerable care is required in order to successfully locate large scale developments in High Value Landscapes without them becoming unduly obtrusive.</p>	<p>53. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>54. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>55. No Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
		<p>56. Should the Draft Plan be amended to support the development of the M20?</p> <p>57. Should the Draft Plan be amended to protect existing assets?</p> <p>58. Should the Draft Plan be amended to allow the Chairs of the Planning and Transport SPCs to meet to co-ordinate policy?</p>	<p>56. The Draft Plan identifies the M20 as a critical piece of infrastructure for the delivery of the population and development growth targets for the County.</p> <p>57. The Draft Plan has set out a suite of policies to protect all the key assets in the County.</p> <p>58. This is an interesting suggestion; however the Draft Plan is not the appropriate forum to consider such a proposal.</p>	<p>56. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>57. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>58. No Amendment Required.</p>
Water Services and Waste	<p>Acknowledge the importance of providing key water services infrastructure in particular to the main settlements in the county so that population targets set out in the SWRPG and the Core Strategy can be capable of been met while at the same time protecting the environment from any adverse effects.</p> <p>Clarification that, in line with EU and national waste policy, that strategic large scale waste treatment facilities includes waste to energy recovery facilities, and amendment to policy</p>	<p>59. Acknowledge the importance of providing key water services infrastructure in particular to the main settlements.</p> <p>60. Should Objective ZU 3-7 of the Draft Plan be amended to better reflect national waste management policy?</p>	<p>59. Noted.</p> <p>60. It is intended to delete ZU 3-7 (b) and to make minor changes to ZU 3-7 (c) to ensure that it is compliant with national waste management policy.</p>	<p>59. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>60. Amendment Required.</p>

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>objective ZU 3-7(b) of the draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>The County Development Plan should include an objective to recognize the critical importance of the Lower Lee Flood Relief Scheme to both the City and County.</p> <p>An objective should be included to facilitate and support the efficient implementation of the final proposed flood defence measures, both operational and infrastructural and to incorporate recommended proposals into the relevant Local Area Plans upon release of Lee CFRAMs Report, including amending flood risk mapping within LAPs.</p>	<p>61. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the critical importance of the Lower Lee Flood Relief Scheme?</p> <p>62. Should the Draft Plan be amended to include an objective which facilitates and supports the efficient implementation of the final proposed flood defence measures under Lee CFRAMS?</p>	<p>61. The final Lee CFRAM has not been published to date and it may be necessary to amend the Plan when it is finalised. The Council has outlined its intention to update the flood maps as new information becomes available in paragraph 11.6.8 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>62. The final Lee CFRAM has not been published to date and it may be necessary to amend the Plan when it is finalised. The Council has outlined its intention to update the flood maps as new information becomes available in paragraph 11.6.8 of the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>61. No Amendment Required.</p> <p>62. No Amendment Required.</p>
Heritage	Supports the intentions in addressing the Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht recommendations from the publication of the	63. Support the approach taken in the Draft Plan to dealing with structures on the NIAH.	63. Noted.	63. No Amendment Required.

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
	National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) for County Cork and the additional structures added to the RPS which are identified in Appendix D. Recognise fully the new section dealing with the Arts, the needs of communities, the development of arts spaces and the encouragement of arts, cultural and entertainment facilities.	64. Recognise fully the new section dealing with the Arts.	64. Noted.	64. No Amendment Required.
Green Infrastructures and Environment	Acknowledge the recognition of the importance of managing sustainably the Counties Green Infrastructure as a key building block for quality of life, protection of our natural heritage and as a key economic asset	65. Acknowledge the recognition of the importance of managing sustainably the County’s Green Infrastructure.	65. Noted.	65. No Amendment Required.
‘Putting this Plan into Practice’	Supports the identification of the key infrastructure required in order to achieve the plans vision so that other infrastructure providers can include that infrastructure in their respective priority lists. Concerned that developments in Stoneview, Monard, Ballyvolane, Carrigtwohill, Midleton, Ballincollig and Mallow <i>and other areas in Metropolitan Cork</i> are all stalled due to a lack of infrastructure and a lack of master plans particularly to the north of the city. Prioritising the delivery of services for Ballyvolane to being immediately required is paramount together with completion of transport study.	66. Supports the identification of the key infrastructure required in order to achieve the plans vision. 67. Should the Draft Plan be amended to ensure that the infrastructure and master plans for key development sites in Metropolitan Cork are delivered? 68. Should the Draft Plan be amended to identify & implement engagement structures that	66. Noted. 67. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 68. Noted.	66. No Amendment Required. 67. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” A “Housing Land Supply and Zoning Policy Framework for LAPs” 68. No Amendment Required.

Chapter	Submission	Principle Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
	<p>Identify & implement engagement structures that support stronger partnerships with key actors across the Atlantic Gateways Initiative (AGI) on joint strategic planning priorities (e.g. telecoms; road/ports infrastructure for agri-exports) to facilitate cohesive planning and strengthen progression of the AGI. See also Chapter 2.</p> <p>The Plan should recognise the vital work currently being undertaken by the Cork Regional Strategic Messaging Group and incorporate a County Council commitment to the development and implementation of a regional strategic messaging campaign for Cork given its critical role in optimising regional economic development, tourism and employment. See also Chapter 2.</p>	<p>support stronger partnerships with key actors across the Atlantic Gateways Initiative?</p> <p>69. Should the Draft Plan be amended to recognise the vital work of the Cork Regional Strategic Messaging Group?</p>	<p>69. Noted</p>	<p>69. No Amendment Required.</p>

Section 2(c) Chief Executive’s Response to the Submission made to Appendix G (Residential Density Proposed Changes to Electoral Area LAP Zoning Objectives)

Introduction

Overview of this Appendix

The Draft County Development Plan makes significant changes to the Country’s policy on residential densities and it is proposed to make consequential changes to residential zoning objectives in the Local Area Plans in order to reflect proposed changes to density objectives in the County Development Plan.

Appendix G of the Draft County Development Plan set out a full list of the proposed changes and one submission was received on this part of the plan as follows:

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executive’s Recommendation
<p>Murnane O’Shea Limited dCDP14/1887</p>	<p>This submission welcomes the changes proposed to the residential density policy, however it requests that R-03 in Glanmire would be better categorised as Medium B rather than Medium A in order to reflect the site’s challenging topography and to accommodate the early delivery of new housing stock to the Glanmire market.</p>	<p>1. Support for the revision to the density categories.</p> <p>2. Can R-03 in Glanmire be categorised as Medium B rather than Medium A?</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. In the amendments to the local area plans which are also going on display with the amendments to the draft County Development Plan, it is proposed that R-03 in Glanmire will be categorised as Medium B as</p>	<p>1. No Change</p> <p>2. Amendment Required. See local area plan amendments.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Submission Summary	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executive's Recommendation
			requested in the submission.	

