



Cork County Development  
Plan Review

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

**Volume One Part Two (b):**  
*Chief Executive's Response and  
Recommendations*  
*Volume Three North Cork*



Comhairle Contae Chorcaí  
Cork County Council



# Table of Contents

<b>Fermoy Municipal District .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Kanturk Mallow Municipal District .....</b>	<b>50</b>

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

**Chief Executive's**

**Response and Recommendations to Submissions**

**Volume Three North Cork**

## Volume 3 North Cork - Fermoy Municipal District

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Aldi Stores (Ireland) Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345452948</b>	DCDP345452948
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission refers to 0.2 hectares of land to the north of Kingston College in Mitchelstown which are located to the immediate west of the existing Aldi Store and the site is bound to the north by the Gradoge River. Submitter makes reference to multiple policy objectives in the NPF, RSES and the draft CDP 2021 to support this submission. It notes the site of the Aldi Store is zoned Town Centre, while the lands immediately west of the Aldi Store consist of woodland as part of Kingston College and are zoned as Green Infrastructure. Submission is seeking for a revision of the draft zoning of a small portion of the lands immediately west of the existing Aldi Store to facilitate their development as an accessible public amenity space for the town, and to provide for a modest amount of additional car parking (37 spaces) to be used as a shared parking resource for both the amenity space and the Aldi store. Submission suggests the expansion of the town centre at this site gives the opportunity to strengthen and consolidate the northern end of the town centre while also opening up pedestrian and cyclist access to the existing woodland area in the grounds of Kingston College in accordance with policies outlined in the draft plan. It highlights the site itself contains mature and semi-mature trees, and also includes a clearing where infestation of Japanese knotweed is evident. Submission highlights the site is relatively flat and a very small portion of the site along its eastern boundary is located in Flood Zone A. However, submission wishes to add that according to the OPW website this site does not have a probability of flooding.</p> <p>Submitter states Mitchelstown Town Centre must become a key focus for the realisation of a thriving sub-regional rural society and economy. Submission request the Council give consideration to a modest increase to the area zoned MH-T-01 "Town Centre" in Mitchelstown from 11.18ha to 11.38ha, to include 0.2ha of land immediately west of the site of the existing Aldi Store on the Dublin Road, in order to support the delivery of utilities/infrastructure/connectivity/town centre policy objectives in the draft CDP 2021.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>a. Should the town centre zoning be extended into the woodland to the west?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>a. The Planning Authority is of the view that the woodland and river corridor is part of a key green spine within the town and extending the town centre zoning would result in the loss of a valuable area of semi-natural woodland along the corridor of the Gradoge River. Proposal is not considered appropriate.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Andrew Meade</b>
<b>DCDP345306508</b>	DCDP345306508
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission is requesting a change of zoning to a small site in Castlelyons/ Bridebridge. It notes the site is self-contained and straddles between

	Bridebridge and Castlelyons village. Submission is seeking for the site to be zoned for housing rather than green infrastructure in order to satisfy a need for housing in the area subject to strict provisions of the rural housing control zone. Submission highlights that the need for housing for the local population will need to be met within the confines of the villages.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should the draft plan be amended to change the green infrastructure zoning to residential?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are of archaeological significance and are not suitable for development. It is proposed to retain its green infrastructure zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Arthur Coughlan</b>
<b>DCDP345908798</b>	DCDP345908798
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission is seeking for the boundary to be extended to the west of Kilworth to include land for residential purposes. Submission notes the land has extensive road frontage along Chapel Road, an infill site between existing residential development and is capable of being serviced by all utility services. It highlights the land is relatively level and is in close proximity to existing amenities while also within easy walking distance to the village centre.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	a) Is there a need to extend the development boundary in Kilworth?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan makes provision of 30 units within the development boundary of Kilworth. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bill O Keeffe</b>
<b>DCDP345709643</b>	DCDP345709643
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land at Conna Cross. Submission states the site is central to the settlement of Conna village and is ideal for low density housing. Submission requests this proposal is considered in the final CDP due to the very little availability of housing in Conna and to meet future needs.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Conna?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan makes provision of 30 units within the development boundary of Conna. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</li> </ul>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bill Power</b>
<b>DCDP345992599</b>	DCDP345992599
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission includes multiple comments on the plan with suggestions for changes to elements relating to Mitchelstown, specifically concerning heritage, streetscapes, biodiversity, tree planting and the natural environment. Suggestions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area between Kinston College and Saint George's Arts and Heritage Centre to be formally designated as 'The Georgian Quarter' in the plan. Funding has been provided for this creation of this area through the RRDP.</li> <li>2. Specify that any developments at the Convent, James Street and between Church Street and James Street should reflect the historic architectural heritage of the town.</li> <li>3. Change the wording in section 1.5.12 to say, "Mitchelstown was built and designed by the Earls of Kingston between 1771 and 1844."</li> <li>4. Under 1.5.16, change "Kings Square" to the correct name of King Square.</li> <li>5. Submission states there is no such place as "Kingswood College Woods" – this should be changed to Kingston College Woodland.</li> <li>6. Requests a name change of Saint George's Church to Saint George's Arts and Heritage Centre and highlight it as the town's newest cultural and performance assets.</li> <li>7. Requests the vista of the Galtee Mountains from the door at Saint George's should be protected and enhanced by the removal of overhead cables and other visual obstructions.</li> <li>8. The vista from George Street, through King Street and into New Market Square, should be noted in the plan as one of the outstanding streetscape features of Mitchelstown.</li> <li>9. Requesting the lands east of George Street (MH R 01 and MH AG 01), adjoining houses on the west side of the street, be screened with trees, so as to restore some of the feel of the 540 acres of woodland that grew in the demesne until the 1940s.</li> <li>10. Requests the preservation of the woodland inside the demesne wall on the corner of George Street and Kildorrery Road is important because it would serve to protect some of the last surviving trees that once sheltered the demesne for its full length of 6.25 miles. The beech trees at Ballinwillin are also worthy of protection.</li> <li>11. Requests under economy and employment the designation of part of Mitchelstown as a Georgian Quarter should be noted.</li> <li>12. Requests it should be an objective of the plan to reduce the number of signs on pavements and projecting from business fronts.</li> <li>13. Under 1.5.41, include, the delivery of high-quality streetscape and town centre retail environment could be achieved through better traffic and parking management.</li> <li>14. Seeking a planting of trees scheme on Church Hill.</li> <li>15. Suggests new wording under Built Heritage and Archaeology to reflect the status and heritage of the town more accurately.</li> </ol>

	<p>16. Under 1.5.54 note in the plan that the graveyard and former church now known as Saint George’s Arts and Heritage Centre, Brigown graveyard and medieval church are National Monuments and protected as archaeological sites.</p> <p>17. Under 1.5.57, note the potential for significant natural habitats in different areas in Mitchelstown asks for these to be included in the plan.</p> <p>18. Suggests different wording for 1.5.58 and 1.5.9 i.e. ‘Mitchelstown Castle Woodlands and Wetlands’ should be retitled ‘Mitchelstown Castle Lakes’.</p> <p>19. Suggests a walking corridor along the Gradoge from Bank Place, through Kingston College Woodland, to the Castle Lakes and onto the relief road through the demesne?</p> <p>20. Requests all developments on MH B 02, MH I 04 and MH I 05 should be well screened by trees and kept back from the roads. Seeking the approach from Cork into Mitchelstown needs enhancement.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Should the plan formally designate</b> Kinston College and Saint George’s Arts and Heritage Centre as ‘The Georgian Quarter’?</li> <li>2. <b>Should any developments at the Convent, James Street and between Church Street and James Street</b> should reflect the historic architectural heritage of the town?</li> <li>3. <b>Should the wording in wording in section 1.5.12 to say,</b> “Mitchelstown was built and designed by the Earls of Kingston between 1771 and 1844.”?</li> <li>4. <b>Should under 1.5.16, change” Kings Square” to the correct name of King Square?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Should “Kings wood College Woods” –be changed to “Kingston College Woodland”?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Should there be a name change of Saint George’s Church to Saint George’s Arts and Heritage Centre and highlight it as the town’s newest cultural and performance assets?</b></li> <li>7. <b>Should the vista of the Galtee Mountains from the door at Saint George’s</b> should be protected and enhanced by the removal of overhead cables and other visual obstructions?</li> <li>8. <b>Should the vista from George Street, through King Street and into New Market Square,</b> should be noted in the plan as one of the outstanding streetscape features of Mitchelstown.</li> <li>9. <b>Should the lands east of George Street (MH R 01 and MH AG 01), adjoining houses on the west side of the street,</b> be screened with trees, so as to restore some of the feel of the 540 acres of woodland that grew in the demesne until the 1940s.?</li> <li>10. <b>Should the trees at Ballinwillin be given protection?</b></li> <li>11. <b>In economy and employment should the designation of part of Mitchelstown as a Georgian Quarter</b> should be noted?</li> <li>12. <b>Should there be an objective of the plan to reduce the number of signs on pavements and projecting from business fronts?</b></li> <li>13. <b>In 1.5.41, should the plan note the delivery of high-quality streetscape and town centre retail environment</b> could be achieved through better traffic and parking management?</li> <li>14. <b>Should trees be planted on Church Hill?</b></li> </ol>



	<p>15. Should there be new wording under Built Heritage and Archaeology to reflect the status and heritage of the town more accurately?</p> <p>16. Should the plan note that the graveyard and former church now known as Saint George’s Arts and Heritage Centre, Brigown graveyard and medieval church are National Monuments and protected as archaeological sites?</p> <p>17. In 1.5.57 should the plan note the potential for significant natural habitats in different areas in Mitchelstown?</p> <p>18. Should the plan change the wording for 1.5.58 and 1.5.9 i.e. ‘Mitchelstown Castle Woodlands and Wetlands’ should be retitled ‘Mitchelstown Castle Lakes’?</p> <p>19. Should a walking corridor along the Gradoge from Bank Place, through Kingston College Woodland, to the Castle Lakes and onto the relief road through the demesne be included in the plan? Should all developments on MH B 02, MH I 04 and MH I 05 should be well screened by trees and kept back from the roads?</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Plan already references the Georgian heritage of Mitchelstown. A change will be made to reference the Georgian Quarter. As this is a factual change it is non material and does not require a formal amendment.</li> <li>2. The policies of the plan address heritage protection and implementation of this is a matter for the development management process. No change proposed.</li> <li>3. The plan can be updated to address factual information about who designed and built the town. This would be non material and does not require a formal amendment.</li> <li>4. Noted. Reference can be updated. This would be non material change and does not require a formal amendment.</li> <li>5. Noted. Reference can be updated. This would be non material change and does not require a formal amendment.</li> <li>6. Noted. Reference can be updated. This would be non material change and does not require a formal amendment.</li> <li>7. Removal of overhead street cables is not a matter for the County Development Plan and should be raised with the Municipal District office.</li> <li>8. Paragraph 1.5.3 of the plan already references the attractive vistas within the town. No change proposed.</li> <li>9. Site specific tree planting proposals are not a matter for the County Development Plan and should be raised with the Municipal District office.</li> <li>10. The Plan already contained many policies and objectives on tree protection. These are considered appropriate.</li> <li>11. This is not considered warranted. No change proposed.</li> <li>12. Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking already contains policies on enhancing the public realm, placemaking and managing street clutter (signs etc). Control of street clutter is a matter for the development management process.</li> <li>13. This is already incorporated in the policies of the plan. See Volume One – Chapters 3 and 9. No change proposed.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. Site specific tree planting proposals are not a matter for the County Development Plan and should be raised with the Municipal District office.</li> <li>15. Existing policies of the plan can be considered sufficient to protect the heritage of the county.</li> <li>16. It is not feasible for the plan to reference all monuments in the County. These are covered elsewhere.</li> <li>17. Existing policies of the plan can be considered sufficient to protect the natural habitats of the county.</li> <li>18. Existing reference is considered acceptable.</li> <li>19. Additional walks can be progressed, as resources allow, through the Municipal District office.</li> <li>20. The specific layout and design of development on a particular site is a matter for the development management process.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> <li>5. No amendment required.</li> <li>6. No amendment required.</li> <li>7. No amendment required.</li> <li>8. No amendment required.</li> <li>9. No amendment required.</li> <li>10. No amendment required.</li> <li>11. No amendment required.</li> <li>12. No amendment required.</li> <li>13. No amendment required.</li> <li>14. No amendment required.</li> <li>15. No amendment required.</li> <li>16. No amendment required.</li> <li>17. No amendment required.</li> <li>18. No amendment required.</li> <li>19. No amendment required</li> <li>20. No amendment required</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Circle K Ireland</b>
<b>DCDP346167864</b>	DCDP346167864
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to Mitchelstown and seeks an expansion of the town centre zoning southwards to include the site of the Circle K filling station and ancillary lands, (located on the Cork Road on the southern approach to the town) , to better reflect the nature of the current filling station / shop use on site and better position the property to contribute to the development of the town centre.</p> <p>Submission notes the general area has a mix of commercial and residential uses with Lidl to the south east, Tesco to the north east and the medical centre and boots pharmacy to the south.</p> <p>Submission includes reference to multiple policies and objectives in the NPF, Retail Planning Guidelines 2012, CDP 2014 and Fermoy Lap 2017 and the Draft CDP 2021 to support the proposal of this submission.</p>

	<p>Submission highlights the site is at the edge of the proposed town centre and has long been in commercial use as a service station. It states the lands are located at a highly visible gateway junction at the entrance to the town from the south and within easy walking distance to the centre of town. Submission argues that the presence of adjacent uses already indicates that there is already an established level of town centre patronage to this part of the town. It notes it fulfils an important local service function in terms of convenience retailing and effectively contributes to the vitality and viability of the existing town centre and therefore submission requests is established use is acknowledged in the new CDP by providing the site within an appropriate town centre zoning objective. Submission highlights the nature of service stations in terms of their role and function in the retailing hierarchy is changing with significant additional ancillary uses now been provided to meet customer expectation and this should be acknowledged in the CDP with appropriate town centre zoning objectives to not have any policy constrains on their further development.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1. Is there a need for more land for town centres uses in Mitchelstown?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. There is already an extensive area zoned for town centre uses in Mitchelstown and there are many opportunities within this area for redevelopment and regeneration of vacant and underutilised sites and this is the priority over the plan period. It is not considered appropriate to expand the area for town centre uses. Any proposals for the development of the lands the subject of this submission can be considered on their merits as part of the development management process.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1. No amendment required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr Frank O'Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP346130465</b>	DCDP346130465
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission requests that the Council would put out to public consultation whether Doneraile should remain a village settlement or is designated a town settlement going forward during the life time of the CDP 2022.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1. Is there a need to hold a public consultation on whether Doneraile should remain a village settlement or be designated as a main town?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan has gone out to public consultation and we received no submissions on this issue. No changes proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>a) No amendment required.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Colin &amp; William Higgins</b>
<b>DCDP345898381</b>	DCDP345898381
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to the zoning of lands at Mondaniel, Rathcormac, approximately 0.5km north of the village of Rathcormack on the R639 opposite Rathcormack Tyres. There is a garden centre operating on the site. Submission notes that permission was granted for a large extension to an</p>

	existing garden centre in 2013 (ref 12/06480) but due to the economic climate at the time funding was withdrawn and the project was shelved. Submission is of the view this site is ideal for business/commercial/ warehousing development and outlines the many different reasons why the site should be zoned for such purposes. Submission requests for this site to be zoned for such business uses in the CDP.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<b>(a)</b> Is there a need for zoning of business/commercial/ warehousing land in Mondaniel, Rathcormack?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	(a) The Plan has already identified lands for business use in Rathcormack and that is where such new businesses should be located to underpin the sustainable growth of the village itself. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the village would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of Rathcormack and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself. There is an existing garden centre use on the site. Applications for rural business uses can be considered under the provisions of Chapters 5 and 8 of Volume One of the Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	1. No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Colman O'Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP345467154</b>	DCDP345467154
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to land in Corrin, 3km south east of the town of Fermoy within the greenbelt. Submission requests (a) a stronger and more positive development approach to be applied for existing industrial areas within Greenbelt Areas and (b) that the lands at Corrin, detailed in this submission, be rezoned for industrial/ warehousing/ logistics type uses. It includes references to the policies and objectives in the CDP 2014 and the proposed Draft Plan. The site is situated in an area where the surrounding land uses are light industrial / agricultural, has access available off a local road and is adjacent to the M8. It notes the site is bound to the south by South Coast Logistics and to the west by Veolia and Flyco and includes details of the history of these companies. Submission mentions this site was previously granted permission for a commercial vehicle test centre facility but on appeal, the decision was overturned by An Bord Pleanála and permission was refused.</p> <p>Submission is of the view that Objective RP5-16 in the Draft Plan is not strong enough for An Bord Pleanála to support proposals for the expansion of long-established uses in the greenbelt and is seeking a more positive approach to be taken with more emphasis on the expansion of these uses in the objective.</p> <p>Secondly, submission requests the Council modifies its settlement boundary of Fermoy to include these lands within the development boundary and zone for Business and General Employment. Submission suggests this site is suitable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to existing foul and stormwater drainage.</li> <li>2. Accessibility to the M8 Motorway.</li> <li>3. Good access to a wide range of facilities and services</li> <li>4. Site is more suitable than adjacent lands.</li> </ol>

	<p>5. Site is not affected by an environmental or heritage designations. Submission includes letters from companies Veolia, Specto and Southcoast to support the zoning of these lands as industrial for future expansion. It has also included a Visual Impact Assessment for this site at Corrin to further support this submission.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>1. Does the plan's approach to development of industrial uses in the green belt need to change? 2. Is it appropriate to zone land within the green belt for new industrial use?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The rationale for the protecting greenbelt land from sporadic development is set out within Chapter 5 Rural of Volume One of the Plan and Objective RP 5-19.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of Volume One, and objectives TM 12-1 and TM 12-2 and TM 12.12 deal with the protection of the function, safety and efficiency of the road network, the promotion of active travel and the integration of land use and transportation to ensure development is planned and consolidated to maximise accessibility by public transport and facilitate walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Plan has already identified lands (61.8ha) for business and industrial use in Fermoy town and that is considered the optimum location for such new uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and support compact growth and active travel, while also protecting the strategic function of the M8 in line with national policy. Zoned lands within the town already have good access to the M8. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the town would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of the town of Fermoy and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself.</p> <p>Existing objectives of the plan cater for the development needs of established uses in greenbelt areas. Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes are proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>ConnaBride Plastics</b>
<b>DCDP344524004</b>	DCDP344524004
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to the land to the rear of the existing ConnaBride plastics plant in Conna.</p> <p>Some of the land is already zoned for business use and the balance is unzoned but within the development boundary of the village and borders a nursing home to the south. The submission requests that the entire undeveloped land holding of ConnaBride plastics be zoned for commercial /</p>

	industrial use to facilitate the expansion of the ConnaBride facility. The submission highlights that ConnaBride Plastics is a significant employer in the area and wish to expand in the near future.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for additional commercial/ industrial land in the village of Conna?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority acknowledges Conna Bride Plastics are significant employer in the area and considers an expansion of the B-01 site to accommodate growth of the existing business is appropriate. It is therefore proposed to amend the Plan and extend B-01 in Conna to facilitate expansion of existing business to north
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment no 3.1.11.4
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Co-Operative Marts</b>
<b>DCDP346206022</b>	DCDP346206022
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to the Cork Co-operative Marts Complex at Corrin to the south of Fermoy. It highlights the site is not zoned and it is within the Green Belt, however given the cluster of established commercial uses and excellent location in terms of road infrastructure it is requested that the site is given a Business and General Employment Zoning Designation. It makes reference to RSES, the draft plan 2022, Fermoy LAP 2017 to support proposals in this submission.</p> <p>Submission notes the Draft CDP does acknowledge the presence of Cork Livestock Mart and its strategic location outside Fermoy town to accommodate some development, however, submitter is of the view that the statement is not broad enough in scope to realise development on the site and this is evidenced by the fact that the site has remained undeveloped for many years. It suggests the site has adequate water and wastewater infrastructure and also benefits from excellent road infrastructure.</p> <p>Submission suggests adding to paragraph 1.4.32 to include development such as the haulage sector and/or vehicle testing facilities. It is also recommended that similar to FY B 05, the site is given a Business and General Employment zoning designation FY B-06, making provision for 'Business Use Development Proposals could include ancillary sales or services related to animal health/ animal food or the agricultural machinery/ haulage sector or vehicle testing services'.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	1. Does the plan's approach to development of business / industrial uses in the green belt need to change?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>(a) The Cork Livestock Marts Facility is located in the green belt south of Fermoy and was permitted in the greenbelt as an exception to greenbelt policy in the context of facilitating its relocation from Fermoy town centre and the connection of the use with the rural area. The submission is now seeking a zoning to reflect the use and to facilitate an intensification of business uses in the area to cater for other non-related uses.</p> <p>The rationale for the protecting greenbelt land from sporadic development is set out within Chapter 5 Rural of Volume One of the</p>

	<p>Plan and Objective RP 5-19. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of Volume One, and objectives TM 12-1 and TM 12-2 and TM 12.12 deals with the protection of the function, safety and efficiency of the road network, the promotion of active travel and the integration of land use and transportation to ensure development is planned and consolidated to maximise accessibility by public transport and facilitate walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Plan has already identified 61.8ha of land for business and industrial use in Fermoy town and that is considered the optimum location for such new uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and support compact growth and active travel, while also protecting the strategic function of the M8 in line with national policy. Zoned lands within the town already have good access to the M8. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the town would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of the town of Fermoy and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself.</p> <p>Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes are proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cork Co-Operative Marts</b>
<b>DCDP346066832</b>	DCDP346066832
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission is made on behalf of Cork Co-Operative Marts in relation to their land in Mitchelstown, zoned for residential development, MH-R-02 in the 2017LAP. Under the Draft Plan the site is partially zoned for Residential (MH R-01) and the balance is zoned as agriculture (MH – AG- 01). The submission is strongly opposed to the change of zoning and seeks the restoration of the residential zoning to the entire land holding, as per the current LAP.</p> <p>Submission notes the lands have been zoned for 18 years and are the closest residential zoned lands to the town centre within walking distance of all services – zoning some of it for agriculture is without reason. The land has not been developed to date due to economic factors and constraints on the availability of water services in the town but a master plan for the development of the land is being prepared and pre planning discussion with the Council have been positive. An application for 52 units and a community building is due to be submitted shortly. There is demand for new housing in Mitchelstown, but the water services issues need to be resolved before it can take place. Submission notes proposed changes to the zoning</p>

	will undermine the deliverability of the scheme and render it impossible. Submission includes references to the local and wider planning context and to wider policies in the CDP 2014, Fermoy LAP 2017, RSES, NPF and the draft CDP 2021 to support the proposals in this submission and notes the zoning of this site will help meet the target of 40% new housing in the existing built up area. Submission does not agree with the paragraph in the draft plan 1.5.8 referring to tier 1 sites. It is of the view that the Mart site as a whole is a tier 1 site and the rezoning of sections of this land is unviable and therefore the whole site should be retained.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have the most sustainable sites been selected for residential zoning in Mitchelstown?</li> <li>2. Should the MH- AG -01 lands be rezoned for residential use?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development.</li> <li>2. It is considered appropriate to alter the MH-R-01 boundary to include additional land for residential use, and reduce the area zoned for agriculture - MH – AG- 01.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. Amendment required to MH-R-01/ MH-AG-01. See amendment no 3.1.5.10, 3.1.5.11 and 3.1.5.12</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Craigfort Construction Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345208653</b>	DCDP345208653
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to land located in the townland of Coolcarron to the south of the Fermoy town. It includes a site context and notes the town is well served by infrastructure while also benefitting from a flood relief scheme. Submission highlights that a SHD application is being actively progressed for the site, with the pre-application request having been submitted to An Bord Pleanála in May of this year. Submitter refers to a number of objectives in the NPF, RSES, CDP 2014, Fermoy LAP 2017 and the draft CDP 2022 to support the submission. It is of the view that concentrating development to the south of Fermoy should be prioritised to optimise key infrastructure investments and to promote sustainable transport throughout the town. Submission fully supports the proposed Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and other uses and FY-R-04 zoning for these lands and ask that it be adopted as part of the final CDP.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Submission supports the approach of the Draft Plan to the zoning of lands at Coolcarron, south of Fermoy.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Crispin Developments Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344618836</b>	DCDP344618836
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to a site located next to the Texaco service station to the south of the town, along Cork Road, Fermoy. There are currently two



	<p>dwellings on the site. The submission notes in the Draft CDP, the site is now zoned as 'Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Use'. Submission wishes to highlight the site was recently the subject of positive pre-planning consultation with Cork County Council and plans for residential development are at an advanced stage. This submission is requesting that the Local Authority review the zoning proposal for this site as 'Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Use' and instead zone the site as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' as per its long established use, and its long term proposed use as a new residential scheme.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should this site be reclassified as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses'?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The mapping error which has incorrectly labelled this site as 'Existing Business' has been noted. Propose to amend the plan so that the land is zoned as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses'
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment 3.1.4.5
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>DANIEL DUANE</b>
<b>DCDP345295096</b>	DCDP345295096
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to land to the north of Doneraile that is just outside the development boundary and currently in the greenbelt. Submission requests the site be included in the development boundary to allow this land to be used for future enhancement of the town. It lists the many different characteristics and advantages of this proposed site. Submitter highlights Doneraile is becoming a village that is attracting many tourists, the population is increasing and suggests development in the village itself will always be limited because of Doneraile park (500 acres). Submission is concerned about the lack of availability of land considering we are in a housing crisis and is of the view that these lands should be zoned. It suggests the following zoning proposals for this site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Low density housing</li> <li>2. Potential retirement village or extension to the existing area allocated for this zoned under X-02 Special Policy Area.</li> <li>3. One off houses.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Doneraile?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 180 units within the development boundary of Doneraile. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>David Lee</b>
<b>DCDP329506462</b>	DCDP329506462

<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission relates to the need for storm water storage and treatment facilities and the need to separate storm water from wastewater. Submission indicates that land must be acquired to manage storm water.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need for proper management and storage of storm water.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Management of surface water is comprehensively addressed in Chapter 11 of the Plan. Separation of foul and storm water is an operational issue for Irish Water.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Declan &amp; Bernadette Browne</b>
<b>DCDP345332662</b>	DCDP345332662
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land within the development boundary of Clondulane. Submission notes there is strong demand for housing in the village and this land is in close proximity to all main services. Submission suggests the zoning of this land will make provision for the supply of houses and/or serviced sites to those unable to obtain planning permission outside the curtilage of the village due to current rural housing policies.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should lands within village development boundaries be zoned for residential use?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority is confining the use of residential zonings to main towns and super key villages. Within the smaller settlements proposals within the development boundaries will be considered on their merits in line with the objectives of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Declan &amp; Bernadette Browne</b>
<b>DCDP345339300</b>	DCDP345339300
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land within the development boundary of Glanworth. The southern portion of the site is specifically zoned for business use. Submission notes there is strong demand for housing in the village and this land is in close proximity to all main services. Submission suggests the zoning of this land will make provision for the supply of houses and/or serviced sites to those unable to obtain planning permission outside the curtilage of the village due to current rural housing policies. Submission requests these lands be considered for residential development as they are an intrinsic part of the village.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to retain the business zoning on land within the village of Glanworth?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The planning history on this site in recent years has been for business use and no change is proposed. There are already ample lands within the village for residential use.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Denis Myers</b>

<b>DCDP346163929</b>	DCDP346163929
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission refers to land outside the development boundary of Kildorrery. It proposes to extend the development boundary on the west side of the village to include the extra two acres of land within the settlement for residential development as it is a natural progression of the existing boundary. Submitter has a proven track record of building houses in Kildorrery with 45 houses already developed to the east and is seeking to develop this land within the lifetime of this plan. Submission notes the intention to lodge a planning application for houses of various types and affordability and outlines the multiple advantages of this site if zoned.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Kildorrery?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 50 units within the development boundary of Kildorrery. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Don McAuliffe</b>
<b>DCDP345241131</b>	DCDP345241131
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to a 2.5 acres sites on the western side of Killavullen which is described as an infill site bounded to the east and west by long established residential uses and within easy walking distance of the village centre and local services. Submission is seeking to regularise the settlement boundary for the village of Killavullen to include the lands in question within the boundary.</p> <p>While the LAP 2017 shows the site is within Flood Zone A, submission indicates that a flood risk assessment completed for an application in 2010 shows the site can “justify and pass a site-specific flood risk assessment”. Submission indicates that other lands at a lower elevation and further from the village are included within the boundary.</p> <p>Submission notes based on the CDP draft zoning map a significant proportion of the lands within the development boundary of Killavullen are identified within a flood risk zone.</p> <p>Submission also notes that the scale of growth allocated to smaller settlements has been significantly reduced and requests provision should be included within the plan to allow for the transfer of development allocation between settlements within the same area where one settlement is under-performing and the other is constrained by the allocation and states the text could be similar to the ‘Active Land Management’ outlined in Section 1.9 of the current (2017) West Cork LAP.</p> <p>Submission requests the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lands referenced in the submission be included within the development boundary and given the opportunity to justify their development by way of a site-specific flood risk assessment.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The growth/development allocation for rural villages, including Killavullen should be increased from 20 to 30 units that isn't limited "local needs only".</li> <li>3. Request that the Council re-introduce an 'Active Land Management' process where villages with capacity to deliver housing units could absorb some of the growth allocation for villages that are underperforming, or which do not have the infrastructure/capacity to accommodate growth.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Should the development boundary of Killavullen be extended to include these lands?</li> <li>b) Should more growth be allocated to smaller villages like Killavullen.?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revised flood risk mapping is now available as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the plan and this shows changes in the areas of flood risk in Killavullen. While the lands subject of this submission are no longer shown to be at risk of fluvial flooding, they remain within the Blackwater River SAC and are therefore not suited to development. No change to the village development boundary is therefore proposed. The Plan will be amended to include an updated flood risk map for the village.</li> <li>2. The growth allocation for each settlement has been carefully considered so that growth is concentrated in the settlements that have the most potential to accommodate that growth. The allocation for Killavullen is considered reasonable for the lifetime of the plan. As part of the Active Land Management process, development in villages will be monitored over the life of the plan and consideration can be given to a reallocation of growth as appropriate.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) No amendment required.</li> <li>d) No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donal &amp; Mary O'Flynn</b>
<b>DCDP345770442</b>	DCDP345770442
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land to the north of Castletownroche and is seeking for it to be zoned for housing in the forthcoming County Development Plan. Submission wishes to highlight the lands are adjoining the village, have ample public water/ public waste water treatment facilities and broadband connections. Submission is also concerned about the strong local housing need in the village.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Castletownroche?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority considers it appropriate to extend the boundary to north of Castletownroche to include this small site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment no 3.1.10.3
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Donald &amp; Diarmuid Costello</b>
<b>DCDP346078264</b>	DCDP346078264
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to the MH-R-12 zoning in Mitchelstown as per the current LAP and is requesting for it to be retained in the forthcoming plan. Submission highlights a current planning application is being prepared on the site for a 100-bed nursing home and ancillary housing which will be

	lodged in the next few months. It notes the submitters have successfully managed to secure and ensure operation of another nursing home site in Charleville, Co. Cork which is currently being developed and wishes to do the same in Mitchelstown on this site.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to reinstate land for residential use to the south of Mitchelstown?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient land zoned in Mitchelstown to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Elaine Cronin</b>
<b>DCDP345285597</b>	DCDP345285597
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission refers to land to the south of Killavullen and is seeking a boundary extension to the village to include these lands. Submission argues there is land adjacent to this site that have been included in the development boundary for 20 years that has never had a planning application submitted and is of the view that it is unfairly limiting any possibility of development. Submission outlines the planning history in the village for residential development, highlights the lack of options for locals and notes nearly all the land within the current Development Boundary is in a flood zone. The submission lists the benefits of this particular site and states it would be a very modest inclusion within the Development Boundary that would finish off the existing cluster and recognise an already established pattern of very low-density development. Submission makes reference to a submission by the Killavullen Community Council to the CDP in 2001 to further support the proposal to include the land in the development boundary.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Killavullen?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority considers it appropriate to extend the boundary in Killavullen to include a section of this site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment no 3.1.21.4
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fermoy Forum</b>
<b>DCDP345521967</b>	DCDP345521967
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This Submission made by Fermoy Forum, a voluntary organisation representing the needs of Fermoy town. This submission covers a range of topics, highlights are outlined below: 1. Submission agrees within the number of units required for the town in the plan period. However, highlights there is a significant need for 4 bed houses in Fermoy, only 124 of these units were built as part of a housing scheme in the last 20 years. It also questions the rationale for de-zoning residential land in a number of areas in the town. 2. Apply town centre first policy to siting new developments. 3. Notes the high vacancy rates in towns and requests the Council include a

	<p>policy to acquire vacant/ derelict properties and renovate to provide living over the shop opportunities.</p> <p>4. Recommended additional amenity needs to cater for the expected population growth.</p> <p>5. Registering public rights of ways under the development plan.</p> <p>6. The need to review, update and implement the recommendations from the traffic study prepared in (2008) and the Walking and Cycling Strategies for Cork Active Travel Towns prepared in 2013.</p> <p>7. Further supports required in Fermoy to identify and maximising suitable locations for outdoor dining.</p> <p>8. Highlights reasons and benefits for Cork County Council to acquire the former Mart site (FY-RA-01) as an investment to achieve many of the objectives of this draft plan.</p> <p>9. Requests an Urban Design and Public Realm Study to be carried out for each town.</p> <p>10. Promote and support the development of Work Hubs and include an objective for repurposing Derelict/Vacant properties through Council acquisitions.</p> <p>11. Requests the council identify the need for the addition of a storm water retention pond to the treatment plant as well as specific treatment upgrades to support attracting Agri-Food industries.</p> <p>12. Welcoming the feasibility study being carried out for a greenway in Fermoy incorporating the old Viaduct. Additionally, Provide safe cycling infrastructure between local towns and villages, e.g. between Mitchelstown through Fermoy to Rathcormack.</p> <p>13. Requests sufficient EV charging points and cycle parking on each approach to the town.</p> <p>14. Suggests public outdoor recreation facilities should be improved and modern trends recognised and targeted.</p> <p>15. Identify Knockananig Reservoir as a bathing water area and an enhanced amenity in Fermoy</p> <p>16. Notes the opportunity for the further development of loop walks around Glenabo.</p> <p>17. Support microgeneration of Energy and support community involvement in energy initiatives.</p> <p>18. Encourages and support green infrastructure in the area.</p> <p>19. Support the development of A Digital Archive/Gallery.</p> <p>20. Promote local action and participation is a key to success in maintaining and enhancing biodiversity. Submission outlines a number of actions to be addressed under biodiversity.</p> <p>21. Suggests Cork County should seek to establish itself as the national leader in the use of Electric Cars.</p> <p>22. Requests the new County Development Plan should secure and enhance the special status of the Blackwater river.</p> <p>23. Outlines a number of initiatives to help address Climate Change and Environmental issues.</p> <p>24. Engage with Coillte with a view to encouraging them to incorporate a greater diversity of tree species with particular reference to native Irish species when they are replanting areas of forestry.</p> <p>25. Include measures to assist in the promotion of sustainable environmentally friendly food production and supports for individuals and</p>
--	--

	<p>small companies focused on the development of foods with a Cork provenance.</p> <p>26. Recycle bins should be provided in towns to ensure that coffee cups etc. are properly disposed of.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Should the plan apply a town first policy approach?</li> <li>b) Is there a need for the plan to include a policy to acquire vacant/ derelict properties and renovate to provide living over the shop opportunities?</li> <li>c) Is there a need for additional amenities in Fermoy?</li> <li>d) Should public rights of way be registered in the plan?</li> <li>e) Should the plan include a commitment to update and implement the recommendations from the traffic study prepared in (2008) and the Walking and Cycling Strategies for Cork Active Travel Towns prepared in 2013?</li> <li>f) Should further support be given to support outdoor dining in Fermoy?</li> <li>g) Should the plan support the development of Work Hubs and include an objective for repurposing Derelict/Vacant properties through Council acquisitions?</li> <li>h) Should the plan identify the need for the addition of a storm water retention pond to the treatment plant as well as specific treatment upgrades to support attracting Agri-Food industries?</li> <li>i) Should the plan promote EV charging points and cycle parking on each approach to the town and promote Cork as the national leader in the use of Electric Cars?</li> <li>j) Does the plan need to support the improvement of public outdoor recreation facilities and modern trends to be recognised and targeted?</li> <li>k) Should the plan identify Knockananig Reservoir as a bathing water area and an enhanced amenity in Fermoy?</li> <li>l) Should the plan include initiatives to promote climate change action?</li> <li>m) Should the plan include reference to the special status of the river Blackwater?</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The town Centre First Approach has been implemented across the county. See section 9.3 in Volume 1 of the Draft Plan.</li> <li>2. Objective TCR9-02 Vacancy and Regeneration has committed to Develop a strategy to reduce vacancy in town centres during the lifetime of the Plan by utilising measures which seek to manage and ease overall vacancy.</li> <li>3. The plan supports the provision for additional amenities to be developed in all settlements.</li> <li>4. The Planning Authority does not wish to register the rights of way in the plan. See section 14.6 instead.</li> <li>5. This is an operation issue for the Municipal District Office and is beyond the scope of the County Development Plan.</li> <li>6. Outdoor dining is supported in objective PL3-1.</li> <li>7. See chapter 8 section 8.11 in relation to work hubs.</li> <li>8. The plan addresses water services in Chapter 11.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. The plan addresses EV charging point and cycle parking in chapter 12 Transport and Mobility.</li> <li>10. The plan does recognise and support the improvement of public outdoor recreation facilities. See chapter 10 tourism.</li> <li>11. This is not a matter for the County Development Plan.</li> <li>12. The Plan has dedicated a chapter to Climate Action. See chapter 17.</li> <li>13. The Plan has made Reference to the River Blackwater in Chapter 11 Water Management.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> <li>3. No amendment required.</li> <li>4. No amendment required.</li> <li>5. No amendment required.</li> <li>6. No amendment required.</li> <li>7. No amendment required.</li> <li>8. No amendment required.</li> <li>9. No amendment required.</li> <li>10. No amendment required.</li> <li>11. No amendment required.</li> <li>12. No amendment required.</li> <li>13. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Fitzgerald Family</b>
<b>DCDP345886342</b>	DCDP345886342
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to 6 hectares of land in Corrin, Fermoy. It includes references to the policies and objectives in the NPF, Development Plan Guidelines for Local Authorities 2007, RSES, CDP 2014 Fermoy LAP 2017 and the proposed draft plan. The site is not zoned for development in the Draft CDP and is currently within the greenbelt but otherwise unconstrained. Submission requests that the site is zoned for industrial/ warehousing/ logistics type uses in the forthcoming CDP for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic location just off the M8 motorway.</li> <li>2. Industrial type uses are not suitable in locations close to town centres/ residential areas and are more appropriate on lands on the edge of towns such as out client's site.</li> <li>3. Sites zoned for industry in the Draft Plan have been zoned for years without ever coming forward for development. Submission is of the view it is not realistic to expect these sites to be developed in the draft plan life cycle.</li> <li>4. Argues there are no constraints to development i.e. no protected structures on the site, the site is outside any designated architectural conservation areas, the site is not within an area prone to flooding, is not without or adjacent to any designated Natura 2000 sites and there are no obvious pathways to any designated sites etc.</li> </ol> <p>Submission states it is not unusual for industrial zoned lands to be further away from the towns in Cork and notes examples in Watergrasshill and Macroom. Submissions has also carried out a detailed review of the three industrial zonings in Fermoy and notes all three sites have been zoned for</p>



	<p>over 10 years without ever coming forward for development. Submission suggests the site could connect to existing water and foul sewer pipelines and safe adequate access can be provided.</p> <p>Letters from Controlled Environment Solutions and Dempsey of Cork are included to support this submission, highlighting their interest in occupying the land. Submission requests that the Council give serious consideration to zone this site for commercial/ industrial/ warehousing/ logistic type uses.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it appropriate to zone land within the green belt for new industrial use?</li> <li>• Does Fermoy need more employment land?</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The rationale for the protecting greenbelt land from sporadic development is set out within Chapter 5 Rural of Volume One of the Plan and Objective RP 5-19.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of Volume One, and objectives TM 12-1 and TM 12-2 and TM 12.12 deals with the protection of the function, safety and efficiency of the road network, the promotion of active travel and the integration of land use and transportation to ensure development is planned and consolidated to maximise accessibility by public transport and facilitate walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Plan has already identified 61.8ha of land for business and industrial use in Fermoy town and that is considered the optimum location for such new uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and support compact growth and active travel, while also protecting the strategic function of the M8 in line with national policy. Zoned lands within the town already have good access to the M8. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the town would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of the town of Fermoy and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself.</p> <p>Existing objectives of the plan cater for the development needs of established uses in greenbelt areas. Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes are proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendment required.</li> <li>• No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Frank and Gudrun Shinnick</b>
<b>DCDP345123861</b>	DCDP345123861

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to land to the south of Fermoy, adjacent to residentially zoned lands (FY-R-04) and existing residential and other uses and in close proximity to the town centre.</p> <p>Submitter makes references to policies in the CDP 2014, Fermoy LAP 2017, RSES, Issues paper for the draft plan and the draft CDP 2021 to support the proposals in this submission. It acknowledges the allocation of residential zoned lands in Fermoy is based on policy guidelines for compact growth, development within existing footprints and a sequential approach to development. However, submitter is of the view that there still need to be more flexibility for residential zoned lands in Fermoy. It notes that the Council has already recognised the need to provide Residential Reserve lands in some key settlements in the county and is seeking for the same to be applied to Fermoy. It outlines the numerous benefits of including these lands for residential/ residential reserve while also providing an opportunity to improve connectivity of existing development by providing east-west linkages along the settlement boundary to the south and relieve traffic congestion.</p> <p>Submission requests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a need to introduce Residential Reserve lands in Fermoy to ameliorate negative growth impacts should residential zoned lands, or infill developments not be brought forward during the lifetime of the CDP.</li> <li>2. Part of the lands adjacent to FY-R-04 are included for residential land use in the CDP, as an extension to the southern settlement boundary of Fermoy, either as lands zoned for Residential Development, or as part of a Residential Reserve.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a need to zone additional land for residential use in Fermoy?</li> <li>• Are these lands on the edge of the town well placed to deliver housing over the lifetime of this plan?</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is sufficient land zoned in Fermoy to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development.</li> <li>• It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary to include these lands.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No amendment required.</li> <li>b. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Frank Ross</b>
<b>DCDP344342508</b>	DCDP344342508
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to the lands located approximately 500 metres to the west of Shanballymore village, within a 'Strong Rural Area', where rural housing controls apply.</p> <p>Submission requests that the village development boundary be significantly extended to include these lands and that lands be zoned for residential use; alternatively, submission requests that the rural housing policy for the area around Shanballymore be relaxed to allow small clusters of detached houses</p>

	<p>in the immediate environs of the village – 1km radius of the church for example and within the catchment of the village WWTP.</p> <p>Submission highlights that the village is relatively remote to the surrounding main settlements but has a range of facilities and a WWTP with spare capacity.</p> <p>The submission makes detailed reference to the Rural Housing Guidelines (2005) and notes the draft plan has re-applied the same rural housing approach as the CDP 2014 and suggests this is to the detriment to the Shanballymore area which should not be classified as part of the Strong Rural Area .The submitter is seeking a distinction between Shanballymore and the more scenic landscapes in North Cork and is requesting instead of a broad-brush approach, the application of a more appropriate policy framework is required. Submission notes the lack of development in the general area is reflected in the enrolment numbers of the school and CSO statistics.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>g) Should the development boundary of Shanballymore be significantly extended?</p> <p>h) Should the rural housing policies be amended to provide a more fine-grained approach?</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p><i>f)</i> The plan makes provision of 10 units within the development boundary of Shanballymore. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</p> <p><i>g)</i> The rural housing policy of the Draft Plan is based on the Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities published in 2005 which remain in force. The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage have indicated that new guidelines are being prepared to address rural housing issues. The Council is therefore deferring a review of the rural housing policy of the plan until such time as guidelines are available to inform the review. See discussion in relation to Chapter 5 Rural in Volume One Part One of this report dealing with Key Issues, Responses and Recommendations.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendment required.</li> <li>• No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gerard Hannon</b>
<b>DCDP342561724</b>	DCDP342561724
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission refers to land on both sides of Junction 13 to the south of Mitchelstown. Due to the uncertainty of beef farming at this time, the submitter proposes for the land to north of junction 13 to be zoned for light industrial, warehousing or a biomass plant as the best way to utilise the land. To the south of Junction 13, the submission suggests a zoning change to enable converting the existing farm sheds and the land surrounding it into warehousing.</p>

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need for additional employment / industrial land along the Motorway Junction to the south of Mitchelstown?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>These lands are in the greenbelt south of Mitchelstown and abut Junction 13 of the M8. The lands are located west of the M8.</p> <p>The Plan already makes provision for in excess of 100ha of new land for business and industrial use in Mitchelstown. Further lands are not required for employment use in the area.</p> <p>The rationale for the protecting greenbelt land from sporadic development is set out within Chapter 5 Rural of Volume One of the Plan and Objective RP 5-19. Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of Volume One, and objectives TM 12-1 and TM 12-2 and TM 12.12 deals with the protection of the function, safety and efficiency of the road network, the promotion of active travel and the integration of land use and transportation to ensure development is planned and consolidated to maximise accessibility by public transport and facilitate walking and cycling.</p> <p>Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Gerard Scannell</b>
<b>DCDP335623388</b>	DCDP335623388
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to the amenity zoning RK- C-01 in Rathcormack. Part of the land included in the zoning is private property, unconnected with the adjacent GAA facility. The submission requests that the boundary of RK-C-01 be revised to exclude these lands. The lands are located fronting the public road to the east and to the north of 'Roseville'.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to rezone a section of the RK-C-01 land from Community to Residential Uses?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are not in amenity use and form part of the curtilage of a private residence. It is appropriate to remove the RK- C-01 zoning from the land and rezone it as part of the 'existing residential / mixed residential and other uses zoning'.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment no 3.1.7.5
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Finn</b>
<b>DCDP346229592</b>	DCDP346229592

<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to Mitchelstown and in particular the agriculture zoning MH-AG-03. It notes the 12-hectare site is within the town boundary and had been zoned for residential in previous development plans. Submitter is of the view that this site is very suitable for low density residential development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land is within town boundary.</li> <li>- All public services for water, sewage and electricity are adjacent to property</li> <li>- Land was previously zoned and could not be closer to town centre, church and schools.</li> <li>- Property will be available for market.</li> <li>- Submitter has two family members requiring homes.</li> <li>- It notes that a reservation to the north of the site measuring 10 metres as an entrance was requested under a previous planning application by the planning department to provide access to these 12 hectare lands and is now available to service these lands.</li> <li>- Many other lands are zoned but are not available for market.</li> <li>- Sewage treatment plant is due for upgrading and the submitter understands this should be completed in the next two years.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the submission requests that this area of land be rezoned for residential purposes.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the MH- AG -03 lands be rezoned for residential use, or have the most sustainable sites been selected for residential zoning in Mitchelstown?</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is sufficient land zoned in Mitchelstown to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary to include these lands.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>James Mangan</b>
<b>DCDP346950494</b>	DCDP346950494
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to lands to the south of the Castle Brook estate in Conna village and seeks an extension of the development boundary of the village southwards. Part of the site is already inside the development boundary and submission requests that this be retained, and for the boundary to moved southwards to include the additional land for residential use in the forthcoming CDP.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Conna?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The draft plan makes provision of 30 units within the development boundary of Conna. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary</p>

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John &amp; Margaret O Brien</b>
<b>DCDP344021007</b>	DCDP344021007
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission refers to the lands adjacent to the graveyard in Mitchelstown zoned for agriculture in the draft plan, MH-AG-04, and zoned residential – MH- R-14 in the 2017 LAP.</p> <p>The submission is of the view that this land is an ideal location for housing due to its proximity to the town centre, services, facilities, and the motorway. Submission suggests that due to the pandemic more people now want to vacate the city for rural living and an alternative way of working, giving new opportunities for younger people and towns like Mitchelstown. The submission has concerns about the lack of residential development in Mitchelstown in recent years.</p> <p>The submission requests that the zoning on the land be reinstated for medium density residential zoning due to its accessibility by foot/ car and since it was deemed suitable in the previous plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should the Draft Plan be amended to include additional land for residential use in Mitchelstown?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient land zoned in Mitchelstown to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Atkins &amp; Co Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345936598</b>	DCDP345936598
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to a site on the southern side of Rathcormack village and is seeking an extension to the development boundary to facilitate future residential use. The submission includes a brief site context highlighting that the western road front of the site is within the development boundary and identified as 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' while most of the land to the east is outside the development boundary. Submission outlines the planning history and other recent planning applications within the development boundary of Rathcormack. It makes reference to policies and objectives in the NPF, RSES, CDP2014, Fermoy LAP 2017 and the Draft CDP 2022. Submission is seeking for the lands to be included in the development boundary for the multiple reasons as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Land is under single ownership and underutilised.</li> <li>b. constraint free in terms of built and natural heritage, or flood risk.</li> <li>c. ready defined by a boundary wall, and available for development</li> <li>d. site can be serviced and is partially included in development boundary already.</li> <li>e. Contribute to the achievement of compact urban growth and strengthen the village, help secure employment, contribute to sustainability</li> </ol>

	<p>f. Contribute vital funds to accelerate the provision of additional infrastructure for services and sustainable transportation modes in the area</p> <p>g. facilitate the delivery of additional residential use on infill lands that are close to the core of the village and of an appropriate scale.</p> <p>h. Assist in the provision of attractive alternative options in Rathcormac to counter the trend towards one-off dwellings in the open countryside.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Rathcormack for residential uses?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 200 units within the development boundary of Rathcormack. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Condon</b>
<b>DCDP344839620</b>	DCDP344839620
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission refers to Mitchelstown and specifically the MH-AG-02 zoning. It highlights in the previous plan this land was zoned for residential and requests the zoning is changed back to residential in the final plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes the site has excellent road access as it runs parallel to the former main Cork-Dublin road. It has a speed limit of 80km.</li> <li>• Site adjoins existing housing / employment uses and lands zoned for employment use and can cater for the projected housing growth and deliver some of the affordable and social housing units needed for Mitchelstown.</li> <li>• Site is no longer a greenfield site as a large volume subsoil from other development sites has been deposited on the land. Developing it for housing would improve the appearance of the land.</li> <li>• Site has ready access to services including public sewer, electricity, broadband and mobile phone coverage.</li> <li>• Geology and the Topography of the site make it an ideal site for housing development.</li> <li>• Submission suggests the North Eastern Quarter of the town boundary is potentially the best geographic location to serve the emerging educational needs of Mitchelstown due to its road infrastructure and therefore the site would be in close proximity to educational services.</li> <li>• Existing built footprint of the town will not be able to deliver too many units as building stock is old and unsuited to modern living.</li> </ul>

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the MH- AG -02 lands be rezoned for residential use, or have the most sustainable sites been selected for residential zoning in Mitchelstown?</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is sufficient land zoned in Mitchelstown to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary to include these lands.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendment required.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Condon</b>
<b>DCDP344841411</b>	DCDP344841411
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that land / yard at Gortnahown, Mitchelstown to be zoned as light commercial. Submission indicates that the site comprises 2.14 ha., backs onto the M8 Motorway with 100m of frontage and the entrance to the site is 300m from the access slipway to the M8 at Junction 13. Site is located east of the M8</p> <p>Site was previously used as a compound during the construction of the M8 between 2004-2009 approximately and up to 450 people would have worked from the compound which would have included machinery yards and service plants, fuel storage, concrete batch production, canteen / rest room facilities etc to support the development of the motorway. Submission indicates that the site was subsequently used by Bord Gas for the storage of machinery in connection with the construction of the Gas network in Little Island and was then taken over by Cork County Council who sold it to the current owner in 2014. The site has various services and areas of concrete hard standing related to its previous temporary uses.</p> <p>Submission references plans for a 0.8ha civic amenity centre on part of the holding and outlines that such a facility could serve a wide catchment area with over 30 settlements within a 30-minute drive of the site, while also addressing the need for waste management facilities. Other suggested uses include a garden centre, truck / trailer and storage area, a Type 2 rest area or a mobile work hub to facilitate remote working.</p> <p>Submission seeks a commercial type zoning to facilitate redevelopment of the site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the plan's approach to development of business / industrial uses in the green belt need to change?</li> <li>Is there a need for additional industrial / business land along the M8 Motorway to facilitate uses such as waste management / garden centres/ truck parking/ remote working?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The rationale for the protecting greenbelt land from sporadic development is set out within Chapter 5 Rural of Volume One of the Plan and Objective RP 5-19.



	<p>Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of Volume One, and objectives TM 12-1 and TM 12-2 and TM 12.12 deals with the protection of the function, safety and efficiency of the road network, the promotion of active travel and the integration of land use and transportation to ensure development is planned and consolidated to maximise accessibility by public transport and facilitate walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Plan has already identified over 100ha of land for business and industrial use in Mitchelstown and that is considered the optimum location for new employment uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and support compact growth and active travel, while also protecting the strategic function of the M8 in line with national policy. Zoned lands within the town already have good access to the M8. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the town would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of the town and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself.</p> <p>Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes are proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Condon</b>
<b>DCDP344841732</b>	DCDP344841732
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This is a repeat of submission DCDP344841411 above.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	This is a repeat of submission DCDP344841411 above.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a repeat of submission DCDP344841411 above.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Hynes</b>
<b>DCDP345919831</b>	DCDP345919831
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission is seeking to extend the development boundary of Kilworth to the south to include land currently in the greenbelt and to zone it for residential. Submission wishes to highlight that the site is an infill which is capable of being served by all utilities, has an available access and it is in close proximity to amenities. Submitter notes there has been preplanning discussions with the Council in relation to this site and considers that

	including this area would assist in the achievement of the balanced spatial development of Kilworth.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Kilworth to the south?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The plan makes provision of 30 units within the development boundary of Kilworth. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Paul Ryan, Lourdes O'Mahony, Ronan Ryan</b>
<b>DCDP339746638</b>	DCDP339746638
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to two adjoining sites to the east of the Fermoy Town Park. The sites include the former Caravan Park which is currently in the Existing Built Up Area and the surrounding lands zoned open space known as Kings Inch. The submission is requesting that the Kings Inch lands be zoned the same as the Caravan Park and preferably for both sites to be rezoned to either residential, retail, commercial or light industrial use. The submission is of the view that this land is a prime location for development since it is such a short distance from the town centre and within the development boundary. It acknowledges that the southern lower section of the Kings Inch site is susceptible to flooding but states the northern portion of the land is not. The submission suggests that the land can be readily developed without the need for major infrastructure investment and is seeking the Planning Authority reconsider the zoning for the site.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should lands that are at risk of flood be zoned for development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site identified as a former caravan park is located within Food Zone A, and given its development history, is located within the 'existing residential, mixed residential and other uses' zone. The balance of the lands are greenfield and are within flood zone A. The guidelines on flood risk management indicate that development should be avoided in areas at risk of flooding. There are ample other lands available for development in Fermoy that are not at risk of flooding. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>JR Oronco</b>
<b>DCDP344754258</b>	DCDP344754258
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission refers to the Motorway Service area (MSA) at Junction 14 on the M8 Motorway and 3kms north of the town of Fermoy. The facility lies to the east of the interchange, on the R639 regional road (former N8) connecting Fermoy and Mitchelstown. The Moorepark Agricultural Research Centre

	<p>operated by Teagasc is located immediately opposite the MSA and both are accessed from a roundabout on to the R639.</p> <p>Submission highlights since the MSA opened at Junction 14, it has made a very significant contribution to the safety and well-being of motorists and hauliers and other M8 Motorway users. Submission makes reference to different policies such as Trans European Transport Networks (TEN-T) Regulations, NRA Policy on Motorway Service Areas, Technical Guidance Document NRA TA 70/14, CDP2014 and the Draft Plan to support the proposals below.</p> <p>Submission argues while the 2017 CDP (objective TM 3-1(f)), states that the Council will consider the most up-to-date guidance in relation to the provision of Service and Rest Areas on the National Road Network, the Draft CDP provides no such guidance.</p> <p>It also requests recognition of this well-established business and a strengthening of objective RP 5-16 to allow a more positive approach to the expansion of well- established businesses within the Greenbelt, within the forthcoming CDP will ensure that any future growth/expansion of this site can be supported by the Council and An Bord Pleanála.</p> <p>Submission outlines that the MSA will need to be expanded in the future and the plan needs to be revised to support such expansion. The location of the site within the greenbelt is considered an impediment to such expansion. Submission argues that omitting lands from greenbelts is not new territory in Cork and is of the view that the existing MSA should be omitted from the greenbelt considering its important function and to facilitate its expansion. Submission seeks the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Updating of the County Development Plan Policy so that it is fully consistent with NRA Policy and Standards for Motorway Service Areas.</li> <li>○ Requests that the County Development Plan Policy is aligned with NRA Policy and Standards for Motorway Service Areas particularly the expansion of MSA's in line with the NRA's Technical Guidance Document NRA TA 70/14.</li> <li>○ Review of greenbelt policies as they apply to the sites of motorway services facilities in light of NRA policy for such facilities and to omit the existing MSA and expansion area from the Fermoy Greenbelt in the forthcoming CDP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the plan's approach to development of business / industrial uses in the green belt need to change?</li> <li>2. Are current plan policies fully consistent with NRA Policy and Standards for Motorway Service Areas (MSA)?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<p>a) The current motorway services facility was permitted under the greenbelt policies of the plan and it is considered that the same greenbelt policies will support an expansion to the motorway services facility in the future, if such is warranted to serve the needs of the motorway users and accords with the policy for such facilities</p>

	<p>and the wider objectives of the Development Plan. No change proposed.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility of the draft plan notes that TII service Policy 2014 is currently under review and the plan will take account of any updates to same (section 12.6.5)</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No amendment required.</li> <li>2. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kieran &amp; Denis Linehan</b>
<b>DCDP346204552</b>	DCDP346204552
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to a 1.5-acre site located ½ km west of the centre of Kildorrery village just outside the development boundary. Submission gives a brief site context and notes the topography, it mentions the site is currently outside the development boundary and there are no planning applications on the site in the past five years.</p> <p>Submission highlights all required services for development of the site are either already on the site or are immediately adjacent to the site and notes access is available on the northern boundary on the main Mallow/ Mitchelstown road (N73). It notes there is also pedestrian access to the site and all local services are within walking distance.</p> <p>The proposal in this submission is to make a small extension to the development boundary to encompass the subject site. It notes the land on the opposite side of the road are within the boundary and therefore is of the view this site is a reasonably straightforward option and will facilitate the construction of medium density residential development. Submission also includes a more detailed proposal for the site as it proposes to locate 12 houses on the site following the removal of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Submission highlights there is a development pressure in the area at present and feels this proposal will complement the Kildorrery area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Kildorrery?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 50 units within the development boundary of Kildorrery. It is considered that there is sufficient land available for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Liz Wilkinson, Mary Prunty and John Cotter</b>
<b>DCDP345683205</b>	DCDP345683205
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission is seeking to extend the development boundary in Kilworth village to the north east for residential uses. Submission notes the lands have easy access within the residential development of Pairc na gCapall and the land is readily serviceable both by watermain and effluent treatment. It is of the view that the land is imminently developable without the need for major investment in infrastructure. Submission suggests that development of this site would reduce pressure on the surrounding countryside for one-

	off houses and therefore would be in line with the aspirations set out in the current CDP.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Kilworth?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 30 units within the development boundary of Kilworth. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Louise McHugh</b>
<b>DCDP328670920</b>	DCDP328670920
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission is seeking to have the village development boundary of Shanballymore extended to the east, to include more of the submitters land within the boundary and create an alternative access to lands already within the boundary. The submission states that the land is in close proximity to local amenities and public water services are available (drinking water and waste water treatment). The submission indicates that there is a need for more housing in Shanballymore and there is insufficient land within the current boundary to enable the village to grow.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Shanballymore to the east?</li> <li>2. Does the plan, adequately address the housing needs for a mixed age profile?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The plan makes provision of 10 units within the development boundary of Shanballymore. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.</li> <li>b. The provision of housing for a mixed aged profile is an important consideration of the draft plan and is already provided for in the policies included in Chapter 4 Housing.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No amendment required.</li> <li>b. No amendment required.</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lucy Weir</b>
<b>DCDP346069658</b>	DCDP346069658
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission highlights we are currently in an ecological emergency which includes biodiversity loss, climate change, pollution etc. Submission is of the view the plan is only concerned about human population growth which had impacts for biodiversity loss, pressure to increase intensive farming practices, housing, energy use, jobs, health, etc. Submission feels there is a lack of planning for emergency impacts i.e. the disposal of single use masks which is now causing a global pollution problem. It highlights litter and

	<p>plastic wastes is a huge issue and with increased population levels, will form the basis of further depletion of soils, water and air quality and notes introducing an increased population to the Cork area is only going to generate more issues of concern.</p> <p>In the village of Kilworth submission has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The amenity of Glensheskin Woods is being mismanaged with felling and monoculture forestry. It is seeking for the council to work with Coillte, Teagasc and the army to manage the land more appropriately and ensure there is no more deterioration of the quality of the environment.</li> <li>- Seeking a County wide exploration and re-establishment of rights of way, and good access to the countryside for all citizens. It notes walks to the Castle in Kilworth - Condon or Cloughleigh – are inaccessible now but used to provide a wonderful local attraction. Suggests there needs to be access to open places.</li> <li>- Requests the rivers require proper protections and regeneration programmes.</li> <li>- Suggests Tree planting of native species in the village in consultation with trained individuals would provide huge regenerative benefits and mitigate some of the effects of climate change.</li> <li>- Highlights the need to mitigation strategies for the impacts of climate and biodiversity loss.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a need to include in the plan more emphasis on the planning for emergency impacts?</li> <li>• Does the plan need to include a commitment for a county wide exploration and re-establishment of rights of way?</li> <li>• Is there a need for additional protections for rivers?</li> <li>• Should the plan highlight the need for tree planting of native species in villages?</li> <li>• Should the plan include mitigation strategies for the impacts of climate and biodiversity loss.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) New biodiversity targets and indicators are recommended as amendments to Chapter 19 of the Plan. See Biodiversity Key Issues in Section 2.17 of Volume 1 of this report.</li> <li>d) An amendment is proposed to Chapter 14 of the Plan to make provision for a process of identifying and mapping public rights of way over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>e) Objective WM 11-11: River Channel Protection seeks to ensure adequate protection measures along watercourses, keeping them free from development by ensuring development is kept 10m or other appropriate distance from stream and river banks is line with best practice for riparian corridors. No further changes proposed.</li> <li>f) Policies in the Plan support biodiversity enhancement and the planting of native trees such as Objective BE 15-8 Trees and Woodlands, BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development and BE 15-5 Biodiversity on Council owned and managed land. In addition, recommendations are made to strengthen the wording in Objective 15-6(c) and Objective BE15-4(a) to require a majority of native trees and plants in the landscaping of new development and Council projects.</li> </ul>

	g) Section 17.2 in the Climate Chapter outlines the mitigation and adaptation measures for climate change.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	a) No amendment required. b) No amendment required. c) No amendment required. d) Amendment required. See amendment no. 1.15.8. e) No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Dowd</b>
<b>DCDP345489000</b>	DCDP345489000
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission wishes to highlight that the unfinished housing stock within Ballyhooly has been exhausted yet there is still a strong demand for housing. It notes a portion of their land has already been zoned for educational purposes. Submission is requesting the land to the west of the educational zoning be included in the development boundary for residential uses since it has close proximity to all main services and will make provision for the supply of houses to those who are unable to obtain planning permission outside village due to current rural housing policies.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Ballyhooly?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 50 units within the development boundary of Ballyhooly. Changes to the core strategy has change the unit allocation to 30 units. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary. The Planning Authority proposes to remove the business zoning on the B-01 site so this land will also be available for residential use and will support the sequential and compact development of the village.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment Required. See amendment no 3.1.8.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Luddy</b>
<b>DCDP344783816</b>	DCDP344783816
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to a 4-acre site to the south of Killavullen and requests its inclusion in the development boundary in the forthcoming CDP. Submission notes the sites proximity to services and facilities, the easy access to the site while also highlighting the adjacent lands that have been included within the boundary for the last 20 years have never been for sale or have had any planning applications which is eliminating any opportunity to develop housing in Killavullen. Submission states that practically all of adjacent land to the village centre are in a flood zone, notes the planning history of the village and highlights the lack of options for housing for parishioners. Submission makes reference to a submission by the Killavullen Community Council to the CDP in 2001 to further support the proposal to include the land in the development boundary. It suggests that this would be a very modest inclusion within the development boundary that would finish off the existing cluster and recognise an already established pattern of very low-density development.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Killavullen?

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority considers it appropriate to extend the boundary in Killavullen to include a small portion of this site.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment required. See amendment no.1.21.2
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Feeney</b>
<b>DCDP344533809</b>	DCDP344533809
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to the former Glanbia Creamery Site on the Main Street of Conna. The submission suggests this site is an ideal location for housing but due to economic restraints and an ongoing issue with a wayleave for a storm sewer, the site has not been developed. The submission requests the site to be zoned for Housing / Commercial uses or a mixture of both in the CDP to meet future needs.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should an opportunity site for residential/ commercial uses be identified in the village centre of Conna?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are included within the development boundary of Conna, a key village in the plan. No specific zoning objective is identified for the lands, so any proposals to develop it can be assessed on their merits.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Neilus &amp; Mary Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP345596744</b>	DCDP345596744
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission refers to the village of Coolagown. Submission highlights the sense of community and pride of place in this village and disagrees with the decision to discontinue Coolagown as a village.</p> <p>Submission notes planning permission for two dwellings was granted under 17/06398 within the village.</p> <p>Submission makes references to policies and objectives in the NPF, RSES and the draft CDP to further support the argument that rural villages like Coolagown can deliver strategic planning policy strategic objectives. It places a strong emphasis on rural policies and puts forward an argument to support Coolagown as a settlement that can positively support rural place making. It notes the investment in the village infrastructure and placemaking by the council and highlights recognition the village has received in the Entente Florale Competition, tidy towns, and anti-litter challenge.</p> <p>Submission suggests there is a requirement for the provision lands to meet the needs of residents in Coolagown with three family members intending to apply for planning for dwellings in Coolagown in the next 7 years. It stresses the employment landscape is set to change considerably post pandemic with the continuation of remote working.</p> <p>Submission is of the view that if a sensible level of zoning is applied to the town than an additional ten houses could be developed in Coolagown during the lifetime of the plan.</p>



<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should Coolagown be reinstated as a settlement in the County Development Plan?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. This review was based on services provision, size of settlement and potential to deliver housing over the next Plan period to 2028 and led to the recommendation for the removal of the development boundary of most village nuclei, other locations, and some smaller villages. Any future housing proposals in these settlements will be assessed on the basis of the rural housing policy applicable in the area. Full detail of the network review is set out in Background Document No. 4 Settlements and Placemaking available at <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a> .
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pat Lee</b>
<b>DCDP344255204</b>	DCDP344255204
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission refers to land at Aghern Cross, a village nuclei settlement as part of the 2017 Local Area Plan. Submission is requesting this area will be reconsidered and retained as a settlement in the forthcoming plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Should the settlement of Aghern be reinstated in the County Development Plan?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	A review of the settlement network across the County was carried out as part of the preparation of the Draft CDP. This review was based on services provision, size of settlement and potential to deliver housing over the next Plan period to 2028 and led to the recommendation for the removal of the development boundary of most village nuclei, other locations, and some smaller villages. Any future housing proposals in these settlements will be assessed on the basis of the rural housing policy applicable in the area. Full detail of the network review is set out in Background Document No. 4 Settlements and Placemaking available at <a href="https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf">https://www.corkcoco.ie/sites/default/files/2020-03/background-document-no-4-settlements-and-placemaking.pdf</a>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Patrick Fitzgibbon</b>
<b>DCDP345936549</b>	DCDP345936549
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission focuses on the Mitchelstown Centre and in particular the site of the current disused Mill Building. It suggests improvements of this area will build upon the existing asset and enhance the unique characteristics of this building and its strong association to the cultural and historic past of Mitchelstown. Submission notes the building is positioned close to the Kingston College back gardens and adjacent to the greenbelt area (MH-GC-01), additionally it has planning permission for a cultural re-creation and visitors centre, interpretative meeting space with function room and other

	<p>uses. It mentions the town is located in Irelands Ancient East as well as the Munster Vales tourism branding areas.</p> <p>Submission notes there is an opportunity to develop the overall tourism product of the town with the rejuvenation of this site and building. It is seeking an objective in the CDP to support this development as an opportunity site, to encourage and collaborate in its development and in doing so make it a place to enjoy and connected to the public realm.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	How can the plan best support the retention and reuse of the Mill Building, a protected structure?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority acknowledges the importance of the Mill Building as a historical feature of the town and is noted as a protected structure in the town centre zoning. The Planning Authority would support the redevelopment of this building, provided it is compatible with flood risk uses or can be shown that adequate flood defences are in place. It is noted that permission has already been granted for the development of the Mill. The Plan can be amended to include text noting the importance of the historical Mill Building in Mitchelstown.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment required. See amendment no 3.1.5.18
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Patrick Mulcahy, Miriam Mulcahy &amp; John Mulcahy</b>
<b>DCDP345778986</b>	DCDP345778986
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to the 6.8 ha Ballinwillin lands, in Mitchelstown which had previously been zoned for residential (MH-R-01 and MH-R-11). It notes the site is 1.2km North East of Market Square, surrounded to the west and south by existing housing and has now been zoned for agricultural purposes (MH-AG-02).</p> <p>Submission believes the Council has miscalculated the demand for housing in Mitchelstown and would like to propose an adjustment in the CDP. Submission requests the site is continued as residential in the forthcoming plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It outlines the planning history for the site and notes there was outline permission granted for development of 69 dwellings in 2002.</li> <li>2. Site lies entirely within the boundary of the current Mitchelstown Urban Area and no extension required.</li> <li>3. Lands are Tier 2 adjacent to the current urban utility systems and no major infrastructure developments required.</li> <li>4. Support the vision for the development of housing on tier 2 sites in a sustainable manner</li> <li>5. Lands can accommodate over 150 housing units (@ 20-25 units per hectare)</li> <li>6. Offer a real, immediate, and sustainable alternative to the provision of housing units within the built footprint while this concept is being prepared for roll-out,</li> <li>7. Additional opportunity and housing mix for Mitchelstown in response to the urgent housing need,</li> <li>8. Offers sustainable development and a greater balance to the future development of the Mitchelstown Urban Area.</li> <li>9. Provide for residential development towards the North of the town in</li> </ol>

	<p>order to balance the greater concentration of housing to the South.</p> <p>10. Subject site is within a 15-minute walk of the town centre</p> <p>11. Area is suitable for sympathetic residential or Nursing Home development within the wider community.</p> <p>12. Lands are available for immediate development and this development schedule will align with the upgrade of the Mitchelstown WWTS that is currently under design.</p> <p>Additionally, the submission is of the view that the Council in the preparation of the Draft CDP have not recognised or provided for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The latent demand for housing pre-2016 and since the 2016 census,</li> <li>2. The lack of supply of new housing units since 2008,</li> <li>3. The COVID-19 Pandemic Effect on the housing demands,</li> <li>4. The effect that poor housing supply will have on the economic development of the town.</li> <li>5. The readiness of the Ballinwillin lands for development.</li> <li>6. The delay in readiness for the proposed regeneration sites and upper floor units need to be discontinued as they won't meet short- medium term solutions.</li> </ol> <p>Submission believes that the reduction of the Residential zoned land available for development in the plan by 75% from that provided in the 2017 Local Area Plan will have a catastrophic effect on the development of the community and on the economic development of the town. It suggests the under-provision of Residential zoned lands will be counterproductive as it will restrict the development of Mitchelstown and requests these lands are rezoned for residential in the final plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to rezone the MH-AG-02 site for residential uses?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There is sufficient land zoned in Mitchelstown to meet the growth target for the town and the lands proposed for residential development in the draft plan are considered to be the most appropriate locations for such development, to support the sequential and compact growth of the town over the life of the plan. Lands zoned for agriculture can be consider for development in future reviews of the plan if additional land is required.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Philip, Maurice &amp; Philip O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP346480305</b>	DCDP346480305
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to 90 acres of land to the north Mitchelstown, to the north east of the industrial zoning MH-I-04 and MH-I-05. The land is currently located in the greenbelt outside the development boundary and submission requests that it be zoned for Industrial use. Submission indicates that the land may be of interest to international industrial companies who require large blocks of land for development. It argues that zoning this additional land would consolidate and strengthen the towns economic potential as a leading distribution base for Cork and Munster. Submission notes that the road infrastructure surrounding Mitchelstown provides excellent connectivity around Munster. While companies previously preferred locations like Ringaskiddy, submitter argues that locations like Mitchelstown are now considered suitable given motorway access etc. Submission makes reference to several objectives in the 2017

	LAP, CDP 2014. The submission includes letters from CBRE, Cushman & Wakefield to support this submission. It highlights Mitchelstown has had an established industrial base with Dairygold and the Aldi Distribution centre.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Does Mitchelstown need additional land to industrial / business use?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The Plan already makes provision for in excess of 100ha of new land for business and industrial use in Mitchelstown. Further lands are not required for employment use in the area over the life of the Plan.</p> <p>Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the strategic nature of the national road network.</p> <p>Proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Government Guidelines, 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' – which places an obligation on local authorities to protect existing national routes particularly in terms of capacity and efficiency and guidelines.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Philomena O'Donnell</b>
<b>DCDP345683682</b>	DCDP345683682
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission is seeking to extend the development boundary in Glanworth village to the west for residential uses. Submission notes the lands have easy access off Kerry Lane and the land is readily serviceable both by watermain and effluent treatment. Submission suggests that development of this site would reduce pressure on the surrounding countryside for one-off houses and therefore would be in line with the aspirations set out in the current CDP.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Glanworth?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site is already included inside the development boundary in the draft plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>RDF Architects &amp; Planning Ltd, on behalf of TJ Sheehan Produce Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP334528957</b>	DCDP334528957
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission is seeking to extend the development boundary of Castletownroche to the south, along the Mill Road, to include additional lands (6.93 ha) within the village. The land is currently subject to rural housing controls as part of the 'Strong Rural Area' and is identified as part of a high value landscape.</p> <p>The submission notes the potential for this site for the expansion of the village and requests the land be part of the 'Existing Built Up Area' or identify for 'Mixed Use' purposes. It is of the view that clustering and village growth is a more sustainable measure against rural one-off housing and</p>

	additional land in the village will help provide suitable developments for an ageing population.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is there a need to extend the development boundary of Castletownroche?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan makes provision of 55 units within the development boundary of Castletownroche. It is considered that there is already ample land suitable for development within the development boundary. It is desirable that development takes place in a sequential and compact manner to reinforce the core of the settlement, and it would not therefore be appropriate to enlarge the boundary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Roche &amp; Kenneally Family</b>
<b>DCDP346231954</b>	DCDP346231954
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land in Mitchelstown and in particular the green infrastructure zoning MH-GC-08. Submission suggests that this site is very suitable for low density residential development. The submitter notes the site has been owned by the family since 1990 and the family also have a long business tradition in Mitchelstown. It states the site is in a predominantly residential area and already contains a detached house. The submitters desire for this site is to build very low-density houses for themselves and family members. Submission states that the change of zoning decreases the value of the land. It states that boundary stone wall will be retained and the mature trees to the east of the property will not be altered. It notes all water services are adjacent to the site. Submission is of the view this site will not contribute to open spaces or green areas as it will be open to the public and is seeking the site to change zoning to low density residential in the CDP.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Is it appropriate to rezone the green infrastructure site for residential development?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The site contains mature trees which greatly add to the amenity and biodiversity of the town. The site is bound by an attractive stone wall. Ample lands are available for the development of housing in the town. No change proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sherwood Oak Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344225632</b>	DCDP344225632
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to land located to the north west of the Fermoy town centre, immediately north of the River Blackwater. Submission includes a site context and notes the town is well served by infrastructure while also benefitting from a flood relief scheme. It highlights there has been a recent grant of permission for a garden centre with ancillary homeware section and café on this site. Submission refers to a number of objectives in the Cork Fermoy Town Development Plan 2010-2016 and the Draft County Development Plan 2022-2028. It notes the site in question has been zoned for Green Infrastructure to the south and Existing Residential / Mixed

	Residential and other uses to the north. Submission fully supports the zoning objectives for these lands and requests that it be adopted as part of the final plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Fully supports the zonings in the draft plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No amendment required.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Thomas Hickey</b>
<b>DCDP337489910</b>	DCDP337489910
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission refers to four mixed deciduous broadleaf woodlands in the vicinity of Doneraile that are under threat. Submission is recommending that the Council take control of these woodlands with a tree preservation order to preserve these mixed deciduous habitats.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	How can the plan support the protection of existing woodlands and are Tree Preservation Orders appropriate?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The Planning Authority considers the best way to protect trees and woodlands is as part of a wider Biodiversity/habitat. The objectives in chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Recreation and Chapter 15 Biodiversity in the Draft Plan provide protection for trees.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amendment required. See amendment no 1.15.11 and 1.15.12.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Watfore Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346183948</b>	DCDP346183948
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission focuses on two particular sites in Mitchelstown on Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road. Submission notes Cahir Hill site is 8.14ha in area and is located immediately north of the River Gradoge, with its eastern site boundary abutting the Dublin Road while the site on Clonmel Road is 4.8ha in area and is located along the Clonmel Road, being the site of the current Co-Op Superstore. Submitter makes references to policies in the NPF, RSES, CDP 2014, Fermoy LAP 2017 and the draft CDP 2021 to support the proposals in this submission to support compact growth, reuse of brownfield land, intensification of the built up area for increased population and employment, and balanced regional development.</p> <p>This submission seeks the rezoning of the Cahir Hill site from MH-I-03 Industry and Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses to Business and General Employment to facilitate its development as retail warehouse / business park and to cater for the relocation of the Co- Op store from its current site on the Clonmel Road. Submission suggests the Cahir site is more suited to these uses for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The surrounding development is all business uses.</li> <li>2. Ideal location for a business park considering most the town is in an ACA and therefore the town cannot accommodate a business park centrally.</li> <li>3. Easy access available.</li> <li>4. Site is an ideal transitional location between the town centre and the outer area of the town.</li> </ol>

	<p>5. The Dublin Road is wide and can easily facilitate development and access to this site.</p> <p>In relation to the Clonmel site, the submission seeks its rezoning from Existing Mixed/General Business/Industrial Uses to new Residential. The site is considered more suited to Residential for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are existing, established residential uses to the south, east and north, as well as open space and community uses to the south.</li> <li>2. Very close proximity to schools.</li> <li>3. Notes all residential land are greenfield and highlight the NPF supports regeneration of brownfield and infill sites over greenfield sites. Rezoning this land offers a brownfield redevelopment opportunity.</li> <li>4. Charleville has less than 200 people more living in it than Mitchelstown but has been allocated 3 time more the number of new units up to 2028.</li> </ol> <p>To further support the requests made above, the submission includes the following very detailed reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design Statements for Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road by BRH Design Partners.</li> <li>2. Landscape Design Strategies for Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road by CSR.</li> <li>3. Engineering Reports for Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road by OSL.</li> <li>4. Transportation Reports for Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road by NRB.</li> <li>5. Ecological Reports for Cahir Hill and Clonmel Road by Doherty Environmental.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Would the I-03 industrial zoning in Mitchelstown be more suited to a business zoning to facilitate retail warehousing (including relocation of the Co-Op store) and other business uses?</li> <li>b) Would the site of the Co-op Store on the Clonmel Road in Mitchelstown be suitable for redevelopment for residential use during the lifetime of the new Plan?</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) It is considered appropriate to change the I-03 Industrial zoning to business use and amendment is proposed</li> <li>d) It is considered appropriate to zone the Co-op Store site on the Clonmel Road for Medium Density residential purposes and an amendment is proposed.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Amendment required. See amendment no 3.1.5.7</li> <li>b) Amendment required. See amendment no 3.1.5.9 and 3.1.5.16</li> </ol>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>WRS</b>
<b>DCDP346223640</b>	DCDP346223640
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submission refers to a 2.85-hectare site located in the townland of Cullenagh, approximately 4km south west of the town of Fermoy. The site is located within the Greenbelt. There is an existing Waste, Recovery and Recycling business operating on the site and permission was recently granted for an expansion of same under Planning Ref 20/5959.</p> <p>Submission requests that the site be given a site-specific zoning to reflect its waste use and that consideration be given to providing a civic amenity facility on the site to serve Fermoy.</p> <p>It is considered that green belt polices are too restrictive to support the future expansion of the business as they only support the expansion of</p>

	<p>businesses within the greenbelt in 'special circumstances. Other plan policies support the development of rural businesses so there is a potential conflict between the policies.</p> <p>Submission notes that the site is situated in an area where the surrounding land uses are a mix of one-off rural dwellings, forestry, agricultural and amenity and that WRS is the only business located on the site and has operated there for decades. Submitter makes detailed references to a number of planning policy objectives such as the NPF, RSES, Waste Action Plan for a Circular Economy 2020-2025, Southern Regional Waste Management Plan 2015, CDP2014, and the draft CDP 2022 to support the submission. It notes the Draft CDP includes supportive policies and objectives in relation to Waste Management and Prevention noting the 12 existing Civic Amenity Site in Cork County however, states the Plan fails to recognise other private waste recycling facilities within Cork which also contribute to the recovery of waste.</p> <p>It requests that the Council consider the zoning of the lands at Cullenagh Fermoy for circular waste economy related uses so as to provide the opportunity for Fermoy to contribute to the wider objectives of the Development Plan in relation to waste recycling and the Circular Economy. It considers the site can effectively contribute to the recycling rate proposed by the European Commission for 2030 as part of the Circular Economy Package. Submission highlights the closest Civic Amenity Site to Fermoy is over 30kms away in Mallow and is of the view that there is a need to have a site closer to Fermoy.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Does the plan's approach to development of business / industrial uses in the green belt need to change?
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>The site the subject of this submission is located in the greenbelt south west of Fermoy. As noted in the submission there is an existing established waste use on the site and permission <i>has recently been granted</i> for an expansion of the waste business. It is clear therefore that the greenbelt policies have not hindered the expansion of this facility as planning permission has been granted for same.</p> <p>The Plan has already identified lands (61.8ha) for business and industrial use in Fermoy town and that is considered the optimum location for such new uses to underpin the sustainable growth of the town itself and support compact growth and active travel. Providing for additional sporadic business uses in the rural hinterland of the town would be prejudicial to the sustainable development of the town of Fermoy and would also be injurious to the amenities and character of the rural area itself.</p> <p>Continuous development of new industrial uses in greenbelt areas undermines the rural green belt area, the settlement network of the county and the road network.</p> <p>The Planning Authority considers objective RP 5-13: Land Uses within the County Metropolitan Greenbelt, strong enough.</p> <p>No change proposed</p>



Chief Executive's Recommendation	No amendment required.
----------------------------------	------------------------

## Volume 3 North Cork – Kanturk -Mallow Municipal District

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ann Horgan</b>
<b>DCDP344241638</b>	DCDP344241638
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission proposes to have 6.52 hectares of land at Dromagh designated BG1/BG2 within the plan to facilitate low density development. The submission states that these lands have previous planning for 35 units. It notes the lands are within a short drive of Kanturk and have potential safe access to the N72. It highlights a number of benefits including proximity to church and national school and that there is a community centre and other shops accessible from the site. It notes that the site has the benefit of public water and on-site effluent treatment can service the site.</p> <p>The submission considers that low density development allowing for the sustainable growth of the community is in accordance with the sustainable planning and development of the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	To zone lands at Dromagh as a location to facilitate low density development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Dromagh is not within the identified settlement network. It is however located within a Structurally Weaker Rural Area in which housing needs may be considered on their merits.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anne Daly</b>
<b>DCDP345218401</b>	DCDP345218401
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that lands at Ballysallagh, Charleville are taken out of industrial zoning. There are 2 separate folios identified. If possible it requests that the land parcel of one of the folios be included in the residential zoning for east Charleville as there is already a good deal of residential properties in this area with the appropriate services available and would allow for the continuity of residential properties on the Effin Road.</p> <p>The submission states that the re-zoning of these lands to residential would ensure a balance of residential units within the environs of Charleville and would provide more lands for potential residential development. Residents in this area can access the N20 without the need to go through Charleville Main Street and would therefore be ideal for commutes to both Cork and Limerick.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request that lands are taken out of industrial zoning.</li> <li>2. Requests that one parcel of lands be included in residential zoning as would ensure balance on east side of Charleville.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As there are ample industrially zoned lands in Charleville it is proposed to reduce the amount of zoned lands. This will help to protect the woodlands at Ballysallagh from the threat of</li> </ol>

	<p>development. A green infrastructure zoning is proposed to protect the woodland area and its surrounds.</p> <p>2. Regarding residential lands it is considered that there are ample lands zoned for residential development in Charleville which are more suitably located and proximate to the town centre. It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Core Strategy Key Issue, Volume One, Part One of this Report for more detail in relation to the Core Strategy.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	<p>1. See proposed amendments no. 3.2.4.12, 3.2.4.13 and 3.2.4.14 in Volume Two, Part Two of this Report.</p> <p>2. No change proposed.</p>
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anne Marie Leahy</b>
<b>DCDP344224230</b>	DCDP344224230
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan. Considers this road will impact on resident safety and welfare and the reasons outlined for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise – Will create an exponential noise increase in a cul de sac. Outlines the health risks of noise quoting the EPA, WHO, etc.</li> <li>• Air pollution – Will bring a huge increase in air pollution to the front doors of residents of the estate who did not purchase their homes in this knowledge.</li> <li>• Safety risks for children – a road poses safety risks for children who regularly play on the green area adjacent to the entrance road. Some houses face directly onto the road where the proposed access road would go through</li> <li>• Traffic management – Access road will create a rat run and bring significant volumes of traffic. There are already significant delays accessing the N20 at peak times and significant congestion would be caused. Concerns over the traffic management system that would need to be put in place and its impact on safety and free flow of traffic.</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity – Access road will result in a depletion of biodiversity along its route. Such habitat provides essential corridors for wildlife and hedgerows represent a carbon sink which can be used as climate mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>Accepts the need for a relief road but considers that there are alternative options and substantial greenfield lands at the CV-R-02 and CV-T-02 site which could accommodate an access road in a safer location.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Anne-Marie Leahy</b>

<b>DCDP345910055</b>	DCDP345910055
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan. Considers this road will impact on resident safety and welfare and the reasons outlined for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise – Will create an exponential noise increase in a cul de sac. Outlines the health risks of noise quoting the EPA, WHO, etc.</li> <li>• Air pollution – Will bring a huge increase in air pollution to the front doors of residents of the estate who did not purchase their homes in this knowledge.</li> <li>• Safety risks for children – a road poses safety risks for children who regularly play on the green area adjacent to the entrance road. Some houses face directly onto the road where the proposed access road would go through</li> <li>• Traffic management – Access road will create a rat run and bring significant volumes of traffic. There are already significant delays accessing the N20 at peak times and significant congestion would be caused. Concerns over the traffic management system that would need to be put in place and its impact on safety and free flow of traffic.</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity – Access road will result in a depletion of biodiversity along its route. Such habitat provides essential corridors for wildlife and hedgerows represent a carbon sink which can be used as climate mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>Accepts the need for a relief road but consider that there are alternative options and substantial greenfield lands at the CV-R-02 and CV-T-02 site which could accommodate an access road in a safer location.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Bernard Hennessy</b>
<b>DCDP343127563</b>	DCDP343127563
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission seeks the extension of the Bweeng development boundary and the inclusion of a residential zoning objective for lands which adjoin the existing boundary.</p> <p>It outlines that this proposal is appropriate to the scale and character of the village, will contribute to the sustainability of key village services, provide an alternative to rural housing and maximise existing Irish Water services. The new waste water treatment system is to the south of these lands and should also be included within the development boundary.</p> <p>The submission notes that the developer has carried out a great deal of work in completing the adjoining unfinished estate (Droimneach) since he purchased it in 2015. A letter in support of his work from the residents association is attached.</p>

	The submission notes that there is strong and growing demand for housing in the area, that this proposal can provide additional affordable homes and choice at a time of housing crisis and that national policy is supportive of directing development to established settlements. It notes that there are no flooding or environmental constraints to the future development of these lands and that the developer has engaged in significant investment in flood risk solutions.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	To extend the development boundary in Bweeng to cater for demand for housing in the area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There are ample lands in Bweeng to cater for the scale of growth (10) envisaged and water services issues remain for the village. It is not considered necessary to promote further boundary extensions at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian Feehan</b>
<b>DCDP346126047</b>	DCDP346126047
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests the removal of lands from the NK-B-01 zoning as the owner wishes to continue farming these lands.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Removal of lands from the NK-B-01 zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to revise the zoning so that consideration can be given to a more flexible range of uses on these lands.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the Draft Plan - see proposed amendments no. 3.2.7.3 - 3.2.7.5.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brian Feehan</b>
<b>DCDP345853972</b>	DCDP345853972
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that a portion of lands at Charleville Road, Scarteen Lower, Newmarket are not zoned as NK-B-01 business zoning. He states that all of his lands have been rezoned. The submitter states that he is currently farming this land as has his father before him and respectfully requests the removal of this zoning. The lands in question are highlighted on a map.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Removal of lands from the NK-B-01 zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to revise the zoning so that consideration can be given to a more flexible range of uses on these lands.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the Draft Plan - see proposed amendments no. 3.2.7.3 - 3.2.7.5..
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Brigid and Sally Daly</b>
<b>DCDP345076969</b>	DCDP345076969
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the 50km speed limit on the Kilmallock Road(R515) be moved from its current location outside the IDA industrial estate, to the intersection with the Effin Road.</li> <li>• that this reduced speed limit of 50km be promoted by digital signage</li> </ul>

	<p>indicating that it is a residential area and by the use of traffic restrictors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the footpath between the “Redbrick” Kerry building on the Kilmallock road and the truck entrance to the Kerry factory be upgraded as it is not currently fit for purpose.</li> </ul> <p>The current speed limit of 80km in a residential area and degraded state of footpath do not align with commitments in the plan for sustainable travel, age friendly communities, sustainability of hedgerows, etc.</p> <p>Intervention is particularly important given recent commercial applications in the IDA estate which should significantly impact traffic in the area.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Changes to speed limits and footpath improvement.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	An amendment is included to the Transport Chapter of Volume One of the Draft Plan supporting the principle of reduced speed limits – See Volume Two Part One of this Report. The application of speed limits in particular towns is a matter for a separate legislative process and is outside the scope of this plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Caroline Hayes Noronha &amp; Jeffery Noronha</b>
<b>DCDP345522575</b>	DCDP345522575
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan. Considers this road will impact on resident safety and welfare and the reasons outlined for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion – it would bring significant volumes of traffic. There are already significant delays accessing the N20 at peak times and significant congestion would be caused.</li> <li>• Safety risks for children – a road poses safety risks for children who regularly play on the green area adjacent to the entrance road. Some houses face directly onto the road where the proposed access road would go through.</li> <li>• Pollution – Will bring an increase in pollution to the estate adversely impacting quality of life including impacts on wildlife and green areas.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy and the potential to decrease property values.</li> </ul> <p>Accepts the need for a relief road but considers that there are alternative options including substantial lands at the CV-R-02 site which could accommodate an access road in a safer location without impacting on any existing dwellings.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Charleville Chamber of Commerce Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP344932650</b>	DCDP344932650
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Charleville Chamber of Commerce Ltd wish to put forward a number of items for consideration:</p> <p>Vision - 'To establish Charleville as a vibrant economic town in which to work, live and invest'</p> <p>We want Charleville to grow its population and encourage the expansion and diversification of the employment and service base of Charleville, promoting its potential as an important node on the Atlantic Corridor between the 'gateway' cities of Cork and Limerick whilst providing employment, commercial and industrial services for its surrounding hinterland. It is of critical importance that the M20 motorway, is implemented to relieve the town of through traffic and provide scope for environmental improvements within the town centre.</p> <p>Population and Housing – Need a policy approach which delivers on the uptake of vacant building stock within the built up area and a living over the shop scheme which is fit for purpose. Cork County Council should engage with relevant stakeholders to deliver. CV-R-04 site owned by Cork County Council should be made available primarily for affordable housing. Need to ensure there is not an imbalance between social and affordable housing in the town.</p> <p>Placemaking - Urge Cork Co Council to engage with local stakeholders to find new and creative uses for the historic building stock to enhance the overall appearance of the town centre.</p> <p>Education - Clarification on paragraph 2.4.23 that Mannix College is now an adult learning centre. Population increase will require significant investment in schools and this should be supported.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure - Most green infrastructure in Charleville is inaccessible to the public therefore it is important that with any future housing developments that sufficient space is given over to green infrastructure.</p> <p>Economy and Employment - Support the provision of a route through the lands from station road to Kilmallock road important for investment opportunities. Opportunity for Charleville to leverage its strengths in the food and agri business sector through establishing a 'Food Innovation Hub' in the town. Create additional employment opportunities by utilising the resources and capabilities that have been developed over the years. This includes an unrivalled reputation in the engineering sector which has built up to include some leading companies in Charleville. Strongly urge Cork Co Council to engage with stakeholders in this regard.</p> <p>Town Centres/Parking - Need to solve the critical issue of public parking at the Northern end of the town and explore potential off street parking in this area. This is a challenge for retailers and impacting on footfall in this area. The potential of the CV-RA-01 and CV-RA-02 sites should be explored with stakeholders.</p> <p>Dereliction - Request the local authority to tackle this issue with urgency as it is very damaging to the image of the town.</p> <p>Public Realm - Welcome the re-development of the town plaza at Bruce Place and encourage Cork County Council to look at other areas of the public realm and to work with local organisations in formulating a strategy</p>

	<p>for this to improve the experience and to prioritise funding towards improvements (particularly footpaths on the Main Street).</p> <p>Movement - Support the M20 and insist that there be access points on both the northern and southern approaches to Charleville and that these are within 1-2 kilometres of the town. Strongly urge Cork Co Council to support this position. Need to clarify text in the Draft Plan that there are only 6 trains a day to Dublin from Charleville. From Charleville to Cork, there are currently 5 trains a day with the earliest departing Charleville at 11am. Important that the station becomes a more integral part of the town and that the frequency and timings of the trains are improved so that it can provide a suitable alternative to road travel. Request that there is a proactive approach to the development of pedestrian and cycle connections, in particular to link up with educational facilities which is a significant issue for parents. Consider that objective CV-U-01 local access / relief road should be removed. It is already a dangerous junction on the N20 and the addition of significant traffic volumes of traffic poses a significant risk to safety and will lead to congestion. Include a local access/relief road through lands zoned CV-R-02 which could join up with the N20 in a much safer manner at the junction of the Old Limerick Road and the N20, by means of a new roundabout.</p> <p>Water Services - Request that Cork Co Council immediately engage with Irish Water to ensure that water services issues do not impede the development of Charleville.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To establish a vision for Charleville as a vibrant economic town in which to work, live and invest.</li> <li>2. The need for a policy approach which delivers on the uptake of vacant building stock within the built up area and a living over the shop scheme which is fit for purpose.</li> <li>3. The CV-R-04 site owned by Cork County Council should be made available primarily for affordable housing.</li> <li>4. Urge Cork Co Council to engage with local stakeholders to find new and creative uses for the historic building stock to enhance the overall appearance of the town centre.</li> <li>5. Clarification on paragraph 2.4.23 that Mannix College is now an adult learning centre.</li> <li>6. Population increase will require significant investment in schools and this should be supported.</li> <li>7. Important that future housing developments provide sufficient space for green infrastructure.</li> <li>8. Support the provision of a route through the lands from station road to Kilmallock road as important for investment opportunities.</li> <li>9. Charleville has an opportunity to leverage its strengths in various employment sectors.</li> <li>10. Public parking at the Northern end of the town is a critical issue and need to explore potential off street parking in this area. CV-RA-01 and CV-RA-02 sites should be explored for car parking.</li> <li>11. Need to tackle dereliction with urgency as it impacts the image of the town.</li> <li>12. Encourage further public realm improvements and prioritise funding.</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. Support the M20 and to insist that there be access points on both the northern and southern approaches to Charleville and that these are within 1-2 kilometres of the town.</li> <li>14. Clarify text in the plan relating to trains operating from Charleville.</li> <li>15. Important that the station becomes a more integral part of the town and that the frequency and timings of the trains are improved so that it can provide a suitable alternative to road travel.</li> <li>16. Request that there is a pro-active approach to the development of pedestrian and cycle connections, in particular to link up with educational facilities.</li> <li>17. Objective CV-U-01 local access / relief road should be removed as this is already a dangerous junction on the N20 and will lead to congestion.</li> <li>18. Request that Cork Co Council immediately engage with Irish Water to ensure that water services issues do not impede the development of Charleville.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that the vision outlined is reflected in the text of paragraphs 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 and in objective CV-GO-01 of the Draft Plan as it relates to Charleville.</li> <li>2. Objectives and commitments in Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking aim to deliver on the regeneration of our towns and villages over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>3. The revised core strategy drafted as part of the amendments now indicates that this landholding will be held as residential reserve site. Further consideration will be given to the potential for this site over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>4. Objectives and commitments in Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking and Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage aim to deliver on the regeneration of our towns and villages over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>5. Noted. Amendment proposed.</li> <li>6. The Department of Education and Skills has identified the need for expansion of both primary and post primary facilities based on expected levels of population growth and consider that this could be catered for by expansion of existing facilities. Should the need arise a site for a school has been retained adjoining the existing St. Mary's secondary school. Reflect this in the text of the plan. Amendment proposed.</li> <li>7. Chapter 14 of the Draft Plan sets out the approach to the provision of green infrastructure at both settlement scale and requirements in relation to open space/green infrastructure at development level.</li> <li>8. Noted. It is proposed to retain provision for this route within the plan.</li> <li>9. Include additional text in paragraph 2.4.38 and 2.4.39. Amendment proposed.</li> <li>10. Include new text outlining that can be considered over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>11. Objectives and commitments in Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking aim to deliver on the regeneration of our towns and villages over the lifetime of the plan.</li> </ol>

	<p>12. The Council can give further consideration to this over the lifetime of the plan and there are a number of funding streams that can be considered to assist in improving and upgrading public realm.</p> <p>13. The N/M20 project is supported in this plan. The project is currently at phase 2 (Options Selection) and no decisions have been made on the preferred route. It is therefore premature to make any determinations in relation to this matter.</p> <p>14. Update existing text in 2.4.56.</p> <p>15. Include additional text in paragraph 2.4.56.</p> <p>16. The concept of active travel is threaded through the draft plan and various targets have been set out in relation to same. The Council will continue to promote and seek improvements to facilitate active travel across the settlement network.</p> <p>17. It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.</p> <p>18. Cork County Council are engaged on an ongoing basis with Irish Water to ensure that development is realised in an orderly and co-ordinated manner across the settlement network and will continue to do so.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	A number of amendments to the draft plan are proposed. See proposed amendments no. 3.2.4.3 to 3.2.4.10.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Charleville Heritage Society</b>
<b>DCDP346124801</b>	DCDP346124801
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission outlines the importance of heritage to the town. It asks that no heritage or historical sites be destroyed in future developments as these historical sites will give future generations an insight into our local ancestors.</p> <p>The submission also seeks the development of Charleville town as a Heritage Town incorporating Moatville House and grounds as a tourist and heritage amenity for Charleville and for this to be incorporated within the plan.</p> <p>Submission outlines in some detail the history and context for Charleville. It notes that a lack of natural amenities leaves the town outside the lucrative tourist trade and that Failte Irelands branding has not been helpful for Charleville as neither the Wild Atlantic Way nor the Irelands' Ancient East appear to be appropriate.</p> <p>The Society has a mission to preserve, promote and highlight the historical significance and the heritage of the town. It notes that Charleville is a thriving commercial, industrial, retail and residential centre but there is a need to enhance activity that draws people to visit the town. The Heritage Society aim to promote Charleville as a 'Heritage and Dairy Tourism Town'.</p> <p>In order to generate economic growth they aim to tap into the historical past of the town in particular using the many historical figures as part of</p>

	<p>the narrative.</p> <p>This submission in particular highlights an outline plan to utilize the 12.5 acres at Moatville, in a phased development as a Heritage and Tourist amenity for the town, and eventually restore Moatville House itself. It is proposed to turn the site into a ‘Heritage and Dairyland Park’. The proposed project aims to develop a heritage and tourist amenity to include a parkland with passive and open space within the former demesne house and lodge. The vision proposes to offer multifunctional green infrastructure within the site such as picnic areas, biodiversity areas, etc. This would be based on heritage themes relevant to Charleville which would be the selling point. The advantages of the location are outlined in the submission as well as the benefits that such a project can bring to the town.</p> <p>Submission also includes 3 additional proposals for the town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Naming of the plaza – propose that the new plaza be named after Eliza Lynch (national heroine of Paraguay) who was born in the town rather than after the Bruce family who had no affiliation with Charleville. This could benefit the town from a tourism perspective.</li> <li>- The Former Market House and Courthouse – The Society hope to use this building as a community museum for Charleville. They have recently agreed to work with the Council on securing its future.</li> <li>- Charleville Train Station - The platforms and the surrounds need to be upgraded and made more welcoming and the Society are engaging with Iarnród Éireann. It is understood that Charleville Chamber are interested in working to upgrade the surrounding area outside the train station, to make it more appealing as an important introduction to the town. These points should be referenced in the plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That no heritage or historical sites be destroyed as part of future developments.</li> <li>2. To promote the development of Charleville as a Heritage Town incorporating Moatville House and grounds as a tourist and heritage amenity.</li> <li>3. Appropriateness of national tourism branding for Charleville and need to enhance activities that draw visitors.</li> <li>4. Naming of the new plaza.</li> <li>5. Reuse the Former Market House and Courthouse building as a community museum.</li> <li>6. Need for Charleville Train Station and surrounds to be upgraded.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Charleville’s architectural heritage is reflected in the 55 buildings or other structures entered in the Record of Protected Structures. Protected structures are subject to statutory protection. The main street and surrounds are a designated Architectural Conservation Area. Archaeological sites are also afforded protection under national legislation and policies contained in this plan. These designations and other objectives set out within the plan provide significant protection to heritage/historical sites within the town.</li> <li>2. The draft plan already recognises the heritage potential for the town in paragraph 2.4.42 tourism: ‘There is an opportunity to</li> </ol>

	<p>enhance the overall tourism product of the town, through rejuvenation and sensitive heritage led regeneration of the town centre, public realm improvement and provision of additional tourism and recreational infrastructure where appropriate.’ Furthermore general objective MW-GO-07 of the draft reads as follows: ‘Promote the enhancement of the overall tourism product of the town by supporting appropriate heritage led town centre renewal and ongoing improvement of amenities. Seek to capitalise on the potential of Charleville to connect with other tourism offers in the region.’ In relation to the emerging plans for Moatville house as outlined in the submission it is proposed to add new text to paragraph 2.4.42.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Include new text in paragraph 2.4.44 to address this matter.</li> <li>4. The naming of the new plaza is not a matter for the County Development Plan</li> <li>5. Noted. Paragraph 2.4.42 seeks to promote sensitive heritage led regeneration and paragraph 2.4.44 recognises the opportunity for a museum to be located within the town centre.</li> <li>6. Add new text to paragraph 2.4.56</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	A number of amendments to the draft plan are proposed. See proposed amendments no. 3.2.4.7 to 3.2.4.9.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Charleville Hotels Limited</b>
<b>DCDP344341196</b>	DCDP344341196
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to a portion of the CV-R-04 zoning in Charleville which the landowner intends to develop in the short to medium term. Submission notes that the zoning is part of a wider parcel which is not within their ownership.</p> <p>They have had recent planning applications on this site and state that the text under the new objective does not allow them to bring forward development of the site independently and impacts the site in terms of delivery and viability.</p> <p>The submission proposes alterations to the text of the CV-R-04 objective. Specifically, it requests the removal of the requirement to retain the woodland/biodiversity area. They consider that the site has limited woodland/biodiversity value as evidenced by a tree survey carried out as part of a recent planning application. Submission also recommends that the text of the objective requiring an overall framework for the entire zoning be omitted as well as other text in the objective which it has highlighted.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The removal of the requirement to retain the woodland/biodiversity area as it impacts on the development of their site independently from remainder of the zoning.</li> <li>2. Text of the objective requiring an overall framework for the entire zoning be omitted.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The habitat mapping exercise carried out in 2018 identified this area ‘Deerpark Woodland’ with the following prescription ‘This local biodiversity area comprises a small woodland which includes two areas of semi-natural</li> </ol>

	<p>woodlands: oak-ash-hazel woodland (WN2) and wet willow-alder-ash woodland (WN6). The area of WN2 is dominated by tall, multi-stemmed ash with willow forming a sub-canopy in parts. It is dissected by deep drainage ditches. The WN6 habitat is not a typical representative of the habitat. It includes some wetland elements in the ground flora and is very open with 50% cover of <i>Salix cinerea</i>. Both of these habitats are of Special Conservation Importance in County Cork. Both habitats were evaluated as being of County value. It is recommended that this area is protected to maintain ecological connectivity to areas beyond the LAP boundary. Connectivity to this local biodiversity area could be enhanced within the LAP boundary to improve ecological corridors in the town. This could be done by enhancing existing hedgerows and treelines.’ A site inspection carried out in September 2021 confirmed the continued presence of habitat on site. A number of species were noted included ash, oak, hazel, willow, alder, hawthorn, beech, lime, sycamore, conifer, wild rose, etc. The ecology section recommend that the objective should be retained.</p> <p>2. It is considered appropriate given the scale of available and undeveloped lands in this area that an orderly framework/masterplan for the overall co-ordinated and phased development of the area is provided for in the objective.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Cllr Alan O'Connor</b>
<b>DCDP346170566</b>	DCDP346170566
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission notes that a wooded area has been growing on CV-I-01 site for at least the last forty years and is marked as a part of the green infrastructure of the area. Submission considers whether the wording of the objective could be strengthened to remove the ‘where feasible’ caveat, and the proposed road (U-04) shifted a little westward to avoid running through it.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need to protect woodland area.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The rezoning of this area as green infrastructure is proposed in order to protect the woodland.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.12.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Con Lehane</b>
<b>DCDP346136733</b>	DCDP346136733
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests to have an area of land zoned residential within the Castlemagner Village Development Boundary. This proposal would include an extension of the existing development boundary. Submission states that the landowner wishes to develop these lands in phases with a 24 house scheme in the first phase. It notes that the lands have access to services and that excellent facilities exist in the parish but that residential development is presently at a standstill. The landowner is interested in providing a mix of house types and affordability as well as the

	<p>option of serviced sites.</p> <p>The submission highlights the need for a resolution to wastewater treatment issues but understands that there is potential to improve the existing system with an upgrade to the existing plant. The greater the number of houses that can be developed on this site the greater the development contribution towards upgrading the treatment system will be.</p> <p>Scale of development will also need to be increased from 5 units in a scheme to 30 houses if a proposal is to be economically successful and allow for the improvement of the existing wastewater treatment scheme.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend development boundary and zone residential to cater for residential development at Castlemagner.</li> <li>2. Increase the scale of development from 5 to 30 units.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that there are adequate lands within the development boundary of Castlemagner to cater for the scale of development proposed.</li> <li>2. There are water services issues associated with this village. It is proposed to retain the scale of development as proposed.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>
<b>DCDP345873642</b>	DCDP345873642
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests that land with folio number CK18827 be included in the development boundary of Charleville town. This land had previously been granted planning permission in 1998 reference number N/98/3795, Rathgoggin South, Charleville.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Inclusion of land within development boundary of Charleville
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a relatively minor extension of the current development boundary within a built up area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.11.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>
<b>DCDP345878921</b>	DCDP345878921
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests that land with folio number CK18827 be included in the development boundary of Charleville town. This land had previously been granted planning permission in 1998 reference number N/98/3795, Rathgoggin South, Charleville.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Inclusion of land within development boundary of Charleville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a relatively minor extension of the current development boundary within a built up area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.11.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>

<b>DCDP346277958</b>	DCDP346277958
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that Cork County Council would continue to look at relief road CV-U-01 in the lifetime of this plan for improved infrastructure.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be reassessed.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>
<b>DCDP346277144</b>	DCDP346277144
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks promotion of heritage and tourism in Charleville Town, that Cork County Council would take charge of the Courthouse on Main Street and would look at Moatville House, both of huge heritage to the town of Charleville. This is in line with MW/GO/07.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Promotion of heritage and tourism in Charleville particularly the Courthouse and Moatville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These items have been considered and appropriate amendments proposed.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendments no. 3.2.4.7 and 3.2.4.8.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>
<b>DCDP345977469</b>	DCDP345977469
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission suggests that in view of the projected population growth that Cork County Council would take into account the need for pedestrian and traffic calming measures and availability of a car park in Rathgoggin North Charleville.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need for pedestrian, traffic calming measures and car parking.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Operational matters and other necessary infrastructural requirements can be given further consideration over the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.10.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Councillor Ian Doyle</b>
<b>DCDP345979795</b>	DCDP345979795
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks that the plan be amended on page 135 to note that Charleville has two secondary schools and Mannix College which is controlled by ETB for Adult Further Education and on page 136 that the wildlife area in the Park be included under green infrastructure.

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Update of text in the draft plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to update text in the plan to reflect the issues identified.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no 3.2.4.3.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>David Garvey</b>
<b>DCDP343111494</b>	DCDP343111494
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests the inclusion of additional residential zoned lands in Dromina. The lands in question were included within the development boundary in 2000 when the land was originally purchased. The 2014 plan reduced the boundary and changed the zoning to commercial. The submission seeks that the current commercial zoning reverts back to the original residential zoning and that the development boundary is increased. A map is attached which shows the new zoning proposed. Other points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is not suited to farming</li> <li>• Present zoning for commercial/car showrooms is not a sustainable use</li> <li>• Zoning of this land can provide a range of amenities for the village</li> <li>• A sewage treatment pump is proposed on these lands that will connect the existing sewerage system and houses in the vicinity to the public sewer which is advantageous</li> <li>• Proposal represents sustainable development within Dromina which will be close to the new M20 motorway and offers strong connectivity including rail links to other centres.</li> <li>• Zoning can provide for a range of housing solutions</li> <li>• Surface water disposal is possible to the river Deal to the south</li> <li>• Potential for footpath connectivity exists</li> </ul> <p>Submission includes a number of quotes from members of the Oireachtas and outlines that there is a clear need for new housing in Ireland particularly within the context of remote/flexible working. Also included is a copy of a paragraph from a letter from Dromina Community Council indicating support for the development proposal.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Seeks the reversion of the commercial B-01 zoning to its previous residential zoning and an increase of the development boundary with proposing that land be zoned for a mix of uses primarily residential but with some commercial and amenity.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>This proposal would represent a considerable expansion of the development boundary (much outside the 50kmph speed limits) and peripheral to the core of the village located to the north. There are already ample lands located within the development boundary on which a range of uses can be considered including commercial or amenity.</p> <p>Although Dromina is a key village in the settlement network there are capacity constraints in terms of water services and the scale of development over the plan period is 10 units. It is proposed to retain the boundary for Dromina as currently set out and remove the</p>



	business/commercial B-01 zoning to give consideration to a range of uses on the landholding.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.13.1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Deerpark Heights Residents Association</b>
<b>DCDP345927142</b>	DCDP345927142
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan. Considers this road will impact on resident safety and welfare and the reasons outlined for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion – bring significant volumes of traffic. There are already significant delays accessing the N20 at peak times and significant congestion would be caused.</li> <li>• Safety risks for children – a road poses safety risks for children who regularly play on the green area adjacent to the entrance road. Some houses face directly onto the road where the proposed access road would go through.</li> <li>• Pollution – Will bring an increase in pollution to the estate adversely impacting quality of life including impacts on wildlife and green areas.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy and the potential to decrease property values.</li> </ul> <p>Accepts the need for a relief road but considers that there are alternative options including substantial lands at the CV-R-02 site which could accommodate an access road in a safer location without impacting on any existing dwellings.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Denis Lynch</b>
<b>DCDP345989114</b>	DCDP345989114
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Given the decision on the preferred final route of the Mallow Relief Road, which will ultimately form a new urban/rural boundary, the council should consider increasing the zoning density currently provided for on lands at Spa Glen townland on the northern fringe of Mallow town, This land is sandwiched between the proposed Northern Relief Road and the proposed Greenway/Cycle path.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Potential to increase the zoning density currently provided for on lands at Spa Glen.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not proposed to make any change to the approach to density as set out in the Draft Plan.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Denis Murphy</b>
<b>DCDP344265028</b>	DCDP344265028
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission identifies a site close to Rose Court/Muddy Hill as suitable for compact residential or retail development. It notes that it is accessible to many facilities thus reducing the requirement for a car and is an ideal opportunity site that has lain idle for many years.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Site at Muddy Hill with potential for regeneration.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The draft plan identifies areas which are either zoned as town centre or are within the built up area of the town but need to be highlighted in the event that the opportunity to redevelop them emerges during the lifetime of the plan. The site subject of this submission is located within the identified MW-RA-01 regeneration site 'Thomas Davis Street/Muddy Hill backlands' and can be considered for appropriate redevelopment proposals over the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Greencore plc</b>
<b>DCDP346215098</b>	DCDP346215098
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that;</p> <p>a) part of the overall landholding which has a long established residential use should be excluded from the MW-X-02 zoning objective and be zoned instead for existing residential use to form an enlarged area with the contiguous residential area as shown on map attached to the submission;</p> <p>b) the development objectives for MW-X-02 be widened to include residential use and other forms of mixed uses.</p> <p>Submission highlights that the National Planning Framework and Southern Regional Spatial Economic Strategy support the development of brownfield lands with a view to achieving compact and sustainable growth.</p> <p>The landowners consider that the plan provides an opportunity to review how best to exploit the strategic importance of these former sugar factory lands in meeting the employment and housing needs of North Cork, and Mallow in particular.</p> <p>Submission notes that population targets need to be converted into housing requirements. Mallow, as a key town in North Cork has demonstrated the capacity to grow. Part of the 52 Hectares former sugar factory lands (lands to the west) could contribute to meeting this housing need. This part of the site also benefits from the presence of a public watermain, but a new foul drainage system would need to be designed to serve both the existing and proposed housing, and to replace the existing septic tanks in the area.</p> <p>The Mallow site also offers the opportunities to develop green infrastructure along the banks of the River Blackwater which would be a</p>

	great amenity for the town and provide the catalyst for a longer distance greenway back into the town centre. Submission states the owners would be willing to facilitate such a project should the Council wish to include it as an objective in the plan.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Part of the landholding which has a long established residential use should be zoned as 'existing residential'.</li> <li>2. Development objectives for MW-X-02 to be widened to include residential use and other forms of mixed uses.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is proposed to zone that part of the site which has a long established residential use as 'existing residential/other uses'.</li> <li>2. It is proposed to retain the wording of the MW-X-02 in recognition of the strategic importance of this site for medium to large scale industry/enterprise.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.3.12.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Grogan Property Holdings Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346271603</b>	DCDP346271603
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests an amendment to the CV-B-04 zoning in Charleville, proposing to split the current zoning into 3 different parts as follows:</p> <p>Part 1 – Business uses particularly appropriate for retail warehousing  Part 2 – Business uses. Existing mixed/general business/industrial uses  Part 3 – Residential; 0.6ha existing residential/mixed residential and other uses</p> <p>It states that this will allow the continued appropriate expansion of uses on site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the CV-B-04 zoning be reviewed.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not considered necessary to change the zoning as proposed on the site currently. Adequate lands have already been provided to cater for residential needs over the lifetime of the plan. It is also considered necessary to retain provision for an access road within the zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Grogan Property Holdings</b>
<b>DCDP346082370</b>	DCDP346082370
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests an amendment to the CV-B-04 zoning which proposes to split the current zoning into 3 different parts as follows:</p> <p>Part 1 – Business uses particularly appropriate for retail warehousing  Part 2 – Business uses. Existing mixed/general business/industrial uses  Part 3 – Residential; 0.6ha existing residential/mixed residential and other uses</p> <p>It states that this will allow the continued appropriate expansion of uses on site.</p>

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Requests that the CV-B-04 zoning be reviewed.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not considered necessary to change the zoning as proposed on the site at present. Adequate lands have already been provided to cater for residential needs over the lifetime of the plan. It is also considered necessary to retain provision for an access road within the zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Hallmark Building Services Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP344354002</b>	DCDP344354002
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission welcomes and supports the overall zoning strategy for the Bearforest area of Mallow however it is requested that Objective MW-X-03 be modified as follows:</p> <p>“Bearforest Demesne. Encourage the continuation of current uses in recognition of the high architectural and landscape value of the site, its inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures and designation as an Architectural Conservation Area. Consideration may be given to residential development to include a retirement village and housing accommodation specially designed for elderly people. The retirement village will facilitate the provision of a range of purpose-built accommodation for older people and will include a mix of independent and care supported facilities in a secure and managed environment.</p> <p>The retirement village will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• individual retirement homes that provide for assisted living;</li> <li>• a nursing home (for less mobile residents of the retirement village);</li> <li>• a new medical/health centre and;</li> <li>• a community centre which will provide dining, recreation, hygiene and health care facilities to be shared by the residents and local community on a communal basis.</li> </ul> <p>Any development within the demesne (including to the structures) will be subject to necessary assessments and must be carried out in a sensitive manner that will protect the integrity and character of this site.”</p> <p>This submission highlights the strategic aims of Mallow as a key town, outlines objectives in the plan which support the delivery of housing for older people as well as objectives within the Positive Ageing Strategy. It states that if Mallow is to achieve this vision the strategic planning policy context must support the development of residential uses including accommodation for elderly people and specific sites should be identified for these uses within the plan.</p> <p>A concept sketch for the layout of the demesne is attached to the submission highlighting different areas within the site for the potential uses while the submission contends that the site is suitable regarding criteria such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage and roads infrastructure</li> <li>• Supporting infrastructure and facilities</li> <li>• Physical suitability</li> <li>• Sequential approach</li> <li>• Environment and heritage policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Change the MW-X-03 objective for Bearforest Demesne to allow for retirement village and housing for the elderly.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This site was visited in 2016 with the conservation officer and the wording of the present objective was formulated based on sensitivities of the site and the types of uses that might be appropriate. The structures on site as well as the curtilage are included in the Record of Protected Structures and the demesne is designated an Architectural Conservation Area. In consideration of the high architectural and landscape value of the site it may lend itself to small scale limited development for tourism, cultural and/or educational uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Hallmark Building Services Ltd.</b>
<b>DCDP345606821</b>	DCDP345606821
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks that the eastern portion of their lands at Annabella (c. 12 hectares) be retained for residential use and the western portion (c. 13.5 hectares) be zoned as Residential Reserve. In the current Kanturk Mallow LAP 2017 the site is zoned MW-R-09. In the Draft Plan 4.03 hectares are zoned for residential development (MW-R-06), 8.46 are zoned residential reserve MW-RR-03 and the remainder are situated within the Greenbelt.</p> <p>The developer has already secured a grant of planning permission for 61 no. dwelling houses on the eastern portion of these lands which comprises phase 1 of an envisaged 3 phase development for the entire landholding. A phase 2 Strategic Housing Application for 304 no. units is now underway (a design statement for the proposed development has been submitted and is attached to this submission). The proposed layout provides connections to the remainder of the landholding to the west to allow for the future development of the entire site. The submission notes that the phased approach was agreed with the Council and Irish Water to allow for the augmentation of the water supply for the area and to dovetail with the Council's planned road improvements for the area.</p> <p>The submission argues that it is necessary to reserve land close to the railway station to facilitate the ambition for Mallow as a key town in the RSES and that this is consistent with supporting CMATS. It notes that the train station is only 500 metres east of the landholding that there are already pedestrian links to the town centre and train station with more planned. It notes that these lands are available and deliverable and the site is in line with key national objectives to achieve compact and sustainable led growth.</p> <p>Submission contends that there has been disproportionate dezoning of land in Anabella which are in close proximity to rail and the town centre. All but 2 of 8 residential zonings in the town are located on the eastern side. There are 42 hectares allocated to the eastern side of the town and only 7 hectares to the west. The lands to the west are closer to the railway station, town centre and associated social and community facilities. It also highlights that not all the land identified in the draft CDP is owned by developers or readily available to progress.</p>

	<p>Submission suggests that in the current and preceding plans this part of the town was given particular focus for residential development because of its proximity to the rail station and its easy accessibility to the town centre and that the current approach is counterintuitive and contradicts the previous approach which was heavily predicated on sustainable transport/development.</p> <p>The submission also queries the rationale for retaining 56 hectares of Residential Reserve lands to the northeast of the town stating that it would be more appropriate to have a split of the residential reserve designation between lands on both the eastern and western side of the town.</p> <p>National Guidelines on 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (SRDUA) place a focus on prioritising residential development on lands that are served by existing and / or planned high quality public transport corridors and that also contribute to the development of compact towns and villages.</p> <p>The submission states that the site has access to existing foul and storm water drainage and can cater for immediate residential development. As Mallow is located along this strategic CMATS public transport route, it will be necessary to address more local infrastructure issues also to maximise the potential of lands to provide houses.</p> <p>In order for Mallow to succeed in being a sustainable and travel led settlement, it is imperative that policy provision is provided to improve local infrastructure and also to be able to accommodate sufficient growth and density provisions to ensure that there is demand to maintain the viability of the train station.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Submission proposes to have additional lands at Annabella designated for both residential and residential reserve.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>John Aherne</b>
<b>DCDP341434005</b>	DCDP341434005
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks the zoning of lands for residential outside the current development boundary to the North West of Kanturk. It states that these lands were zoned in the 2003 County Development Plan and that the lands are appropriate for development and serviceable.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Zone additional lands in Kanturk for residential development.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kathleen O'Shea</b>
<b>DCDP346121833</b>	DCDP346121833
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Requests that the NK-R-03 zoning in the current 2017 LAP not be rescinded. There is a demonstrable lack of houses for sale in the town of Newmarket with no new houses being built and most houses suitable for refurbishment having been sold and renovated.</p> <p>Submission considers the demographic projections underpinning the plan have not taken sufficient account of a relatively significant shift of the working population from urban to rural fomented by the necessity of working out-of-office during the present pandemic. Believes this shift will continue to the benefit of Newmarket.</p> <p>Newmarket has been blighted by a lack of growth in recent years and has declined for lack of investment and population renewal. Now when there is a possibility of reversing this decline the Draft Plan proposes to remove the lifeline by rezoning lands which had already been deemed suitable for residential development. Broadband and sufficient housing are key requirements to attract new workers and families and new houses can be built only if there is suitable zoned land available.</p> <p>Requests that if the Council cannot accede completely to the request that a reasonable portion of that land would continue under its present zoning.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the NK-R-03 zoning in the current 2017 LAP not be rescinded.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Kieran Bolster</b>
<b>DCDP344212138</b>	DCDP344212138
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests the zoning of lands for housing at Spa Glen, Mallow. It states that these lands are ideally located close to the heart of Mallow and proximate to services and amenities and can therefore reduce carbon emissions providing a focus for compact urban growth. It notes that all services exist on site (a letter from building surveyor/engineer attached) and there is ample green lands adjacent.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Zoning of lands for housing at Spa Glen, Mallow.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are located within the Spa Glen Amenity Corridor. The general area is dominated by mixed broadleaved woodlands located adjacent to species rich grassland providing an important ecological corridor from north to south. This area has been recognised in previous plans for its recreational value and it is proposed to retain the corridor as an important

	<p>north south green infrastructure corridor in Mallow (MW-GC-01 objective). The Spa Glen was recognised as an important local biodiversity area in the Habitat Mapping carried out in 2018. It is considered important that this area is retained as a strong ecological/amenity corridor and does not become fragmented by development. In addition, there are no services located within this area to serve any development.</p> <p>It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Lisa O'Donoghue</b>
<b>DCDP345891293</b>	DCDP345891293
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests that a portion of lands at Charleville Road, Scarteen Lower, Newmarket are not zoned as NK-B-01 business zoning. Approximately half of the lands have been rezoned.</p> <p>Submission proposes that the lands be rezoned to their original zoning as they were purchased in 2020 with the intention of carrying out farming activities in line with the previous owners dating back to the 1920s. Submission considers that the co-op have ample lands to expand in their ownership and highlights this on a map.</p> <p>Submitter notes that she considers that all land owners should be consulted if the local authority are rezoning land with the full permission of the land owner.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Removal of lands from the NK-B-01 zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is proposed to revise the zoning so that consideration can be given to a more flexible range of uses on these lands.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the Draft Plan - see proposed amendments no. 3.2.7.3 - 3.2.7.5.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Golden</b>
<b>DCDP346179197</b>	DCDP346179197
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission requests modification of the settlement boundary for the key town of Mallow, to include the identified landholding (at Lacknahoola) and to zone all of the eastern portion of these lands (fronting on to the N20) as 'mixed use residential/commercial' and the western portion (to the west of the rail line) as residential reserve.</p> <p>If the level of de-zoning in Mallow as proposed in the draft CDP is not addressed, it will have a negative impact on the potential to facilitate the growth targeted for the town. The huge reduction in residential land supply is likely to result in a decrease in development activity and housing output. The draft plan proposes to zone eight sites for residential development and all but two are located on the eastern side of the town. Query the rationale for retaining 56 hectares of Residential Reserve lands to the northeast of</p>



	<p>the town. It would be more appropriate to have a split of the residential reserve designation between lands on both the eastern and western side of the town.</p> <p>In the 2017 MDLAP and preceding plans the northern part of the town was given particular focus for development/residential development because of its proximity to the rail station and its easy accessibility to the town centre. The disproportionate rezoning of land in this part of the town, within close proximity to rail and the town centre, is completely counterintuitive and contradicts the previous approach which was heavily predicated on sustainable transport/development.</p> <p>Mallow is located along the Cork-Dublin railway line with a train station 500m to the south of these lands that provides hourly connections to Cork City Centre and Dublin. The town also benefits from a range of local services. The lands have direct pedestrian and cyclist links to Mallow town centre and Mallow train station via existing footpaths along the N20 and the local access road which provide direct access to Mallow rail station. The eastern part of these lands adjoin a recently completed service station/restaurant.</p> <p>Overall, it is submitted that a disproportionate amount of land has been rezoned on the northern side of the town in relation to both residential zoning and residential reserve. Submission requests that this imbalance be addressed in the amendments to the draft CDP as set out.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Zone eastern portion of lands (fronting on to the N20) as 'mixed use residential/commercial' and the western portion (to the west of the rail line) as residential reserve.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Martin Hogan</b>
<b>DCDP340163724</b>	DCDP340163724
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission primarily proposes the inclusion of residentially zoned lands close to train stations in the towns of Mallow, Buttevant and Charleville. It also considers that the Mallow - Cobh commuter rail service should be extended to include Charleville and a reopened Buttevant railway station. More detailed proposals for each town are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Mallow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An active transport infrastructure plan for the town needs to be developed. The town centre strategy of the plan makes no mention of delivering a comprehensive active travel network.</li> <li>• A pedestrian bridge to connect the Collegewood estate and school at Castlepark should be developed.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MW-RR-01 and MW-R-04 should be removed to prevent badly planned sprawl and instead zonings should be provided to the north of the town where they can deliver well planned sustainable compact expansion to leverage the rail network.</li> <li>• Lands north of the former rail line should be zoned as residential (area highlighted on map) and the old line should be developed as a local access road with segregated cycle route.</li> <li>• New access road and cycleway connecting to the Beecher Street roundabout should be created to open up access to the MW-R-05, MW-R-06, MW-RR-03 and MW-RR-04 as the Annabella roundabout is at capacity.</li> <li>• MW-SP-02 should be zoned residential based on its unique potential to deliver housing in the heart of the town. There is a lessening demand for retail space and this would enhance town centre vibrancy. This site should not be used for office use as there is already excess supply e.g. Mallow Primary Healthcare Centre.</li> <li>• MW-RA-03 should be zoned for residential development or possibly car parking. It is a better location for a car park than the current plan to remove prominent land in the town park and it would also serve residents of Ballydaheen.</li> <li>• Mallow Town Park should be retained free from car parking which would be damaging to its appearance and function. There are many existing car parks within short walking distance including the potential MW-T-03 and MW-T-05 zonings.</li> <li>• The Quartertown employment area is not well connected to the town lacking footpaths and cycle infrastructure. Connectivity needs to be addressed urgently to allow safe commuting to work.</li> <li>• A roundabout should be constructed at the junction of the R638 and the N20 to allow better access to the Quartertown area and to allow for a new access road from the roundabout to open up the development potential of the MW-I-01(a) and MW-I-01(b).</li> <li>• The former Sugar Factory site (MW-X-02) should be considered for a data centre.</li> <li>• A combined blueway/greenway should be developed along the route of the Blackwater to Fermoy to enhance tourism potential.</li> </ul> <p>Buttevant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development boundary of Buttevant should be extended westward to encompass the old railway station and to allow for residential development between the town and the railway station and in close proximity to secondary school. (map attached)</li> <li>• Reopening of Buttevant train station should be prioritised to allow for residents to commute by rail to other centres.</li> </ul> <p>Charleville:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development boundary of Charleville should be extended south eastward to encompass the railway station and to allow for residential development between the town and the railway station. (map attached)</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include residentially zoned lands close to train stations in the towns of Mallow, Buttevant and Charleville.</li> <li>2. the Mallow - Cobh commuter rail service should be extended to include Charleville and a reopened Buttevant railway station.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Need to deliver an active transport infrastructure plan for Mallow.</li> <li>4. Need for a pedestrian bridge to connect the Collegewood estate and school at Castlepark.</li> <li>5. Need to provide zoning to the north of the town where it can deliver well planned sustainable compact expansion to leverage the rail network.</li> <li>6. Old rail line should be developed as a local access road with segregated cycle route.</li> <li>7. Consider new road and cycleway connecting to the Beecher Street roundabout in order to access residentially zoned lands to the west</li> <li>8. MW-SP-02 should be zoned residential based on its potential to deliver housing in the heart of the town.</li> <li>9. MW-RA-03 should be zoned for residential development or possibly car parking.</li> <li>10. Mallow Town Park should be retained free from car parking as there are many existing car parks within a short walking distance.</li> <li>11. Connectivity to the Quartertown employment area needs to be addressed to allow safe commuting to work.</li> <li>12. A roundabout should be constructed at the junction of the R638 and the N20 to allow better access to the Quartertown area.</li> <li>13. The former Sugar Factory site (MW-X-02) should be considered for a data centre.</li> <li>14. A combined blueway/greenway should be developed along the route of the Blackwater to Fermoy to enhance tourism potential.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Chief Executive's Response</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy.</li> <li>2. Paragraph 2.2.7 of the draft plan provides support for the potential reopening of stations along the Charleville to Cork railway line.</li> <li>3. These issues will be considered in a Local Transport Plan to be prepared under MW-GO-05.</li> <li>4. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>5. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>6. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>7. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report. Paragraph 2.3.62 of the draft plan outlines that a feasibility study is in progress for a 39km greenway from Mallow along the former railway line (via Fermoy) to Ballyduff on the Waterford border. Pending this study being completed and a transport plan for the town consideration of the use of the former line is premature.</li> <li>8. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>9. This site is zoned as MW-T-02 town centre expansion. This zoning allows for a range of uses to be considered on the site including residential.</li> <li>10. These lands are zoned MW-T-06 town/neighbourhood centre in the draft plan. This site represents an important entry point to the site from the south in a visually prominent location. The site is at flood risk so its capacity for residential development is therefore somewhat reduced. It is considered that the use of the site solely as a car park would be an underutilisation of an important site in the town.</li> </ol>

	<p>11. This plan seeks to strengthen our green infrastructure networks recognising their multifunctional roles. Within the green infrastructure zoning proposals which are complementary to this approach can be considered on their merits. The preparation of a Transport plan for Mallow can give further consideration to the need for and location of additional car parking in Mallow.</p> <p>12. The need to improve connectivity from the Quartertown area is already highlighted in paragraph 2.3.52 of the draft plan. The potential to address this can be considered over the lifetime of the plan and in particular through the preparation of a Transport Plan for the town.</p> <p>13. See key issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</p> <p>14. It is considered that the MW-X-02 objective allows for a range of medium or large scale industry/enterprise to be considered on the former sugar factory site.</p> <p>15. The Council are open to consideration of greenways/blueways and other amenities where these can be developed in a manner which takes fully into account appropriate site selection and environmental processes. There are already a number of such projects at various stages of development across the county. In relation to Mallow paragraph 2.3.62 of the draft plan outlines that a feasibility study is in progress for a 39km greenway from Mallow along the former railway line (via Fermoy) to Ballyduff on the Waterford border. Objectives in relation to greenways are set out in chapter 10 Tourism and it is proposed that an additional amendment be made to the plan to include Blueways (see chapter 10 Tourism proposed amendments).</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	Amend the Draft Plan. See proposed amendments.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mary Barry</b>
<b>DCDP346173464</b>	DCDP346173464
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The landowner requests to have their lands included within the development boundary for Glantane Village. It states that approximately one third of the landholding is contained within the current village development boundary in the current Local Area Plan and this proposal would include the entire landholding.</p> <p>The owner is prepared to have the land developed for residential use, subject to suitable water and wastewater infrastructure being in place and proposes low density housing and/or serviced sites as the preferred option, to coincide with the existing village density and character.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Include lands within the development boundary of Glantane.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are already ample lands within the development boundary of Glantane to cater for the scale of growth identified over the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Masterlink Logistics Limited</b>

<b>DCDP346159153</b>	DCDP346159153
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission notes that Masterlink Logistics are market leaders in Full Outsourcing, Logistics and Storage and have an existing facility to the east of the subject lands in New Twopothouse. In particular the submission seeks an addition to the DB-01 Objective for the settlement to include the following text “support the expansion of existing logistics hub to the west of the village”</p> <p>The submission states that the settlement has proven to be an appropriate and successful location to date and its expansion is warranted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need - An analysis of data by Savills on the supply, availability and requirement of employment space in Cork, has identified that there is a notable shortage of available industrial / manufacturing / warehouse stock in the wider Cork area at present and this is hampering market activity. Demand has also increased for logistics operators.</li> <li>• Connectivity - New Twopothouse has proven an ideal location near a convergence of National Roads. The planned completion of the M20 Cork to Limerick Motorway will pass close to the centre. North County Cork is recognised as a strategic location and an ideal staging point for logistics and distribution around the southern region.</li> <li>• Suitability of lands - the current plan designates lands at Dromalour and Buttevant as being suitable for the expansion of logistics however such lands are within close proximity to the Blackwater SAC and increasingly such projects are proceeding to stage 2 Natura Impact Statement and require additional mitigation and safeguards to be put in place. The potential for impacts to the protected status of the SAC from development on their lands is remote.</li> </ul> <p>Submission seeks logistics and light industrial uses in the vicinity of the subject lands which provides for opportunities to develop a cluster of such activities with a local source of employment and skills. In states in addition that the County Council have previously supported the development of these lands (Planning Ref: 09/7307) for logistics.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Addition to the DB-01 Objective for the settlement to support the expansion of existing logistics hub
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	The vision for the village already acknowledges the role of new Twopothouse in relation to employment. Future proposals for expansion of the facility can be considered on their merits in line with the other objectives in the plan and particularly those in the Economy Chapter.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>McCutcheon Halley Planning</b>
<b>DCDP345122139</b>	DCDP345122139

<p><b>Submission Summary</b></p>	<p>This submission outlines the case for policy consideration of a crematorium at a site close to Banteer (site of the former Duhallow Park Hotel). It highlights that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is growing demand for cremation</li> <li>• It is a suitable use for a brownfield site and should be assessed as a commercial site</li> <li>• Site is ideally located providing access to North Cork and Kerry</li> <li>• Previous permission for substantial commercial development on this site</li> <li>• Would generate lower traffic than established and permitted uses</li> <li>• Improves range of social and community facilities and economic benefit for the area</li> </ul> <p>The submission highlights existing policy general policy in the plan including reference to the site in the text of paragraph 2.9.12. It sets the proposal within the context of the NPF highlighting the importance of the rural economy and opportunities that exist.</p> <p>It suggests that the Draft CCDP is not adequately addressing the need to support rural enterprise and employment that there is little support in the Draft CCDP for development of rural brownfield sites outside the development boundaries of towns and villages, and little clarity on how the Council will regard development proposals for rural brownfield sites that are not linked to agricultural diversification or renewable energy production.</p> <p>Submission notes that while the 2018 application for development of crematorium at the site was not successful, the Senior Planner was satisfied that issues relating to traffic, including those raised in a submission by the TII had been satisfactorily dealt with. Submission requests that the Council continues to acknowledge that the redevelopment of brownfield sites is inherently more sustainable than the development of greenfield sites and should be encouraged and proposes an additional Zoning and Land Use Objective (Chapter 18). Submission requests that the Council continue to support diverse rural business models in appropriate locations through the addition of bullet point text to Objective EC 8-11 Rural Economy. Submission requests inclusion of a specific reference and objective to the support the development of a crematorium in the North Cork Strategic Planning Area in view of the growing demand for the provision of cremation facilities in urban and rural areas. Consider that it would be appropriate to provide a general policy statement which promotes the location of this form of community infrastructure on brownfield commercial sites.</p> <p>Submission requests the inclusion of additional text as part of Objective TM 12-8 which provides that development of brownfield sites with existing access onto a national road will normally be considered where it has been demonstrated satisfactorily following submission of a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit that there will be no material impact on the safety and free flow of traffic.</p>
<p><b>Principal Issues Raised</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for support in the Draft CCDP for development of rural brownfield sites outside the development boundaries of towns and villages</li> <li>2. Need for clarity on how the Council will regard development proposals for rural brownfield sites that are not linked to agricultural diversification or renewable energy production.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Plan should acknowledge that the redevelopment of brownfield sites is inherently more sustainable than the development of greenfield sites and should be encouraged and proposes an additional Zoning and Land Use Objective (Chapter 18</li> <li>4. Need for the Council to continue to support diverse rural business models in appropriate locations through the addition of bullet point text to Objective EC 8-11 Rural Economy</li> <li>5. Need for inclusion of a specific reference and objective to the support the development of a crematorium in the North Cork Strategic Planning Area</li> <li>6. Need for the inclusion of additional text as part of Objective TM 12-8 which provides that development of brownfield sites with existing access onto a national road will normally be considered where it has been demonstrated satisfactorily following submission of a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit that there will be no material impact on the safety and free flow of traffic.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new objective proposed as an amendment to the plan in chapter 3 is proposing to recognises the potential of brownfield sites and heritage buildings in rural areas</li> <li>2. As per 1. above.</li> <li>3. The sustainability of brownfield is recognised in the plan. No change proposed.</li> <li>4. As per 1. above.</li> <li>5. This site was previously refused permission by An Bord Pleanala for a crematorium. One of the refusal reasons was in relation to the potential for adverse impact on the N72 national route. A new planning application is currently being considered (planning ref. 21/4718). It is not proposed to expand any further than the existing text in paragraph 2.9.12 which allows for favourable consideration of 'appropriate proposals which seek to promote the redevelopment of the site of the former Duhallow Park Hotel'. This text also needs to be considered in the context of the Government's Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines (2012) and as the location is located in a rural area outside a development boundary it is considered inappropriate to zone these lands.</li> <li>6. The County's road network facilitates movement of goods, services and people and maintaining, improving and protecting its strategic function is therefore crucial for the County's economy and society. As outlined in paragraph 12.16.4, the Government's Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines (2012) remain a key guiding document in relation to planning policy and National Roads. Proposals for development of brownfield sites with existing access onto a national road will be judged on their merits, with regard to these guidelines, as part of the development management process. No amendment proposed.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Moynihan</b>

<b>DCDP342908454</b>	DCDP342908454
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Supports the extension of the residential development boundary in Dromina (on the road exiting the village towards Freemount) to allow for much needed additional housing and additional amenity and recreation space.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Supports the extension of the residential development boundary in Dromina to the south to provide for housing and additional amenity space.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>There are already ample lands located within the development boundary on which a range of uses can be considered including commercial or amenity.</p> <p>Although Dromina is a key village in the settlement network there are capacity constraints in terms of water services and the scale of development over the plan period is 10 units. It is proposed to retain the boundary for Dromina as currently set out and remove the business/commercial B-01 zoning to give consideration to a range of uses in this area.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no 3.2.13.1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Moynihan</b>
<b>DCDP342908914</b>	DCDP342908914
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission supports the extension of the residential development boundary in Bweeng adjacent to the Droimneach Estate to allow for further housing supply.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Support for extension of boundary in Bweeng adjacent to the Droimneach Estate.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	There are ample lands in Bweeng to cater for the scale of growth (10) envisaged and water services issues remain for the development. It is not considered necessary to promote further boundary extensions at this time.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Moynihan</b>
<b>DCDP346190996</b>	DCDP346190996
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that the development boundary at Rathgoggin South, Charleville would be extended to facilitate the provision of badly needed housing in Charleville
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Inclusion of land within development boundary of Charleville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a relatively minor extension of the current development boundary within a built up area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.11.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Michael Moynihan</b>
<b>DCDP346192056</b>	DCDP346192056



<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests the development boundary of Knocknagree village would be extended further out the road towards Ballydesmond to provide for further housing provision in Knocknagree.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Extend the development boundary of Knocknagree.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are already ample lands within the development boundary of Knocknagree to cater for the scale of development proposed.  Note: No specific location suggested in this submission.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mourneabbey Community Council</b>
<b>DCDP346250411</b>	DCDP346250411
<b>Submission Summary</b>	This submission supports the Mourneabbey Community Council Development Plan which emerged after a wide consultation exercise. In May 2020 the community council purchased lands adjacent to the community complex grounds and if they can secure funding they aim to continue to improve facilities. The submission outlines a list of projects they wish to deliver through 2 separate phases on these lands with a percentage of funds also to be ringfenced for community wide projects such as Bothar Glas Walkway, Burnfort Village Plan initiatives, Mourneabbey War of Independence Monument and other community enhancement measures.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Support for the Mourneabbey Community Council Development Plan and various projects within.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Submission is noted. Where feasible the Council endeavour to support the provision of community services to both urban and rural residents.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Mr. and Mrs. Martin Condon</b>
<b>DCDP346157801</b>	DCDP346157801
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests the inclusion of lands within the development boundary at Rathgoggin South, Charleville. It notes that the plot has the benefit of outline planning permission N98/ 3795 for a dwellinghouse and biocycle treatment unit.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Inclusion of land within development boundary of Charleville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This is a relatively minor extension of the current development boundary within a built up area.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.11.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nagle Natural Heritage &amp; Health Promotion Group</b>
<b>DCDP346286629</b>	DCDP346286629
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The Nagle Natural Heritage & Health Promotion Group is proposing that the current Cork County Council Bottlehill Landfill site is returned after 20+

	<p>years to the local Communities as part of the County Development Plan for green Infrastructure and recreational strategy. This section of North Cork is in need of this type of facility and its location would further support Tourism in the North Cork area. There are already many natural walking, cycling and horse back trails in the surrounding communities and a facility as being proposed would link all this existing assets and create something wonderful for North Cork. Our group strongly supports the protection of Natural Heritage and the biodiversity in this part of Cork County.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Propose that Bottlehill Landfill be returned to the local Communities as a recreation facility.</li> <li>2. Promoting of sustainable tourism and particular projects in the Nagle mountains.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. The ownership of the Bottlehill Landfill site is not a matter for the County Development Plan.</p> <p>2. General objectives in the Draft Plan support and promote the development of walking/cycling routes as well as sustainable tourism in the County. In relation to particular projects/proposals detailed site assessments would be required for each element of a particular project including AA, SEA, etc.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nordale Developments</b>
<b>DCDP346279471</b>	DCDP346279471
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests the following provisions for Newtownpothouse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger housing and populations projections for villages such as Newtownpothouse to reflect the National Planning Framework (NPF) and Regional Economic and Spatial Strategy (RSES) objectives to deliver housing in areas where there has been investment in infrastructure.</li> <li>• Introduction of some text allowing for additional development within villages that have benefitted from investment in infrastructure, so that an appropriate housing return can be achieved commensurate with the investment in infrastructure.</li> <li>• Provision should be included to allow for the transfer of development allocation between settlements within the same area where one settlement is under-performing and the other is constrained by the allocation.</li> </ul> <p>Submission proposes to modify Objective DB-01 relating to Newtownpothouse to increase the number of units from 5 no. units proposed under the 2017 LAP to 30 no. units. The village has a good water supply and our lands are already served by a wastewater treatment plant provided as part of the Greenvale development, which was sized to cater for all of our clients lands in Newtownpothouse.</p> <p>Submission requests the re-introduction of an 'Active Land Management' process as outlined in the 2017 LAP where villages with capacity to deliver</p>

	housing units could absorb some of the growth allocation for villages that are under-performing or which do not have the infrastructure/capacity to accommodate growth.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approach to growth targets, infrastructure and scale of growth in villages generally.</li> <li>2. increase the number of units from 5 no. units to 30 no. units.</li> <li>3. Need for 'Active Land Management' approach to growth of villages where capacity can be absorbed in those villages that are underperforming.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See Key Issues in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>2. New Twopothouse is designated as a village within the settlement network. No public wastewater treatment capacity exists in Newtwopothouse therefore it is inappropriate to increase the scale of development.</li> <li>3. Clarification on this issue is required.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See Proposed amendment no. 3.2.19.1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Nordale Developments</b>
<b>DCDP346095202</b>	<b>DCDP346095202</b>
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests the following provisions in the forthcoming CDP for Newtwopothouse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger housing and populations projections for villages such as Newtwopothouse to reflect the National Planning Framework (NPF) and Regional Economic and Spatial Strategy (RSES) objectives to deliver housing in areas where there has been investment in infrastructure.</li> <li>• Introduction of some text allowing for additional development within villages that have benefitted from investment in infrastructure, so that an appropriate housing return can be achieved commensurate with the investment in infrastructure.</li> <li>• Provision should be included to allow for the transfer of development allocation between settlements within the same area where one settlement is under-performing and the other is constrained by the allocation.</li> </ul> <p>Submission proposes to modify Objective DB-01 relating to Newtwopothouse to increase the number of units from 5 no. units proposed under the 2017 LAP to 30 no. units. The village has a good water supply and the lands are already served by a wastewater treatment plant provided as part of the Greenvale development, which was sized to cater for all of the clients lands in Newtwopothouse.</p> <p>Submission requests the re-introduction of an 'Active Land Management' process as outlined in the 2017 LAP where villages with capacity to deliver housing units could absorb some of the growth allocation for villages that are under-performing or which do not have the infrastructure/capacity to accommodate growth.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approach to growth targets, infrastructure and scale of growth in villages generally</li> <li>2. increase the number of units from 5 no. units to 30 no. units.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. Need for 'Active Land Management' approach to growth of villages where capacity can be absorbed in those villages that are underperforming.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>1. See Key Issues in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</p> <p>2. New Twopothouse is designated as a village within the settlement network. No public wastewater treatment capacity exists in Newtwopothouse therefore it is inappropriate to increase the scale of development.</p> <p>3. Clarification on this issue is required.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See Proposed amendment no. 3.2.19.1.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Oakfield Resources Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP345470430</b>	DCDP345470430
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that subject lands are changed from residential reserve (MM-RR-04) and green belt to part 'Residential' and part 'Residential Reserve'. This would equate to 2.6ha of residential zoning and an additional 13.1ha of residential reserve. The entire site currently benefits from a residential zoning in the current plan.</p> <p>The submission contends that a residential zoning is consistent with planning Principals at a national, regional, and local level. The location is within walking distance to the town centre, employment centres and the train station and provides access to key urban centres in the region. It is consistent with the 15 minute city concept and the avoid shift improve policy. The submission claims that infrastructure to deliver the proposed partial residential allocation is available. The development would be contiguous with existing established residential areas and zoned residential land. It will create an attractive and viable place in which to live.</p> <p>Submission notes that 85% of the proposed residential allocations are located to the north and east of the town centre, and 71% of selected sites are located outside of the maximum acceptable walking distance of the railway station. The submission highlights that the proposed distribution of development in the current draft will increase congestion within the town centre and the subject site can be selected to mitigate these traffic impacts as the proposed relief road is unlikely to take place during the plan period. To facilitate the allocation of residential the submission states that consideration could be given to amend allocation from other sites to the east of the town including the MW-R-07 and MW-R-08.</p> <p>The proposed expansion to the 'Residential Reserve' is consistent with the objectives of the Residential Reserve outlined in the Draft Plan. The proposed area should form part of the long term sequential expansion of the settlement. Its delivery will be achievable once critical infrastructure identified in the Draft Plan is delivered.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Zone additional lands as 'residential' presently MW-RR-04 (strategic reserve) and include additional lands adjoining as 'residential reserve'
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.

<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>O'Flynn Construction</b>
<b>DCDP345878087</b>	DCDP345878087
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The purpose of this submission is to welcome the residential zoning of lands at Spa Glen, and the designation of residential reserve status for lands at Keatley Close.</p> <p>O'Flynn Construction (OFC) are the owners of two land parcels at Spa Glen, which are proposed for zoning as Medium-A Residential Development (MW-R-03 and MW-R-04) in the draft Cork County Development Plan. OFC welcome this zoning provision, which is appropriate as the lands are accessible, and deliverable within the lifetime of the forthcoming development plan. The development of these lands will consolidate the residential area to the north-east of Mallow town and will contribute to the dwelling target requirements for the town. OFC wish to confirm that it is their intention to develop these land parcels within the lifetime of the forthcoming development plan.</p> <p>The lands at Keatley Close, identified as part of the proposed Residential Reserve for Mallow, are under the control of OFC. OFC welcomes the Principal of the Residential Reserve lands policy, which will help safeguard against a shortage in supply of zoned lands during the lifetime of the forthcoming development plan. The lands at Keatley Close are suitable for designation as Residential Reserve, as they will consolidate the urban environment to the north-east of Mallow, are accessible to the town centre and deliverable within a medium time frame. OFC confirm that it would be their intention to bring land forward for development at Keatley Close within the medium term.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Support for residential zoning of lands at Spa Glen, and the designation of residential reserve status for lands at Keatley Close.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Pat Curtin</b>
<b>DCDP346131754</b>	DCDP346131754
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks the dezoning of a field on his land at Lower Quartertown, Mallow from commercial to agriculture zoning.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Dezone field from commercial to agriculture zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This site is at the edge of the development boundary and is unlikely to be needed for industrial development over the lifetime of the plan. The submission has requested that it be retained for agriculture. It is considered appropriate that it be returned to green belt zoning.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.3.14.

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Peter and Hilary O’Meara, and Eileen O’ Meara</b>
<b>DCDP346043253</b>	DCDP346043253
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the reinstatement of ‘Medium A Residential’ development to include satisfactory access, servicing and landscape provision / compatible for elderly care centre’ on ‘Parcel A’, and</li> <li>* that the designation of ‘Residential Reserve’ be permitted on ‘Parcel B’ of their landholding at Lacknahoola, Mallow, Co. Cork.</li> </ul> <p>A planning assessment is provided as part of the submission. The site is currently zoned for residential use under Policy Objective MW-R-01 which provides for Medium A Density residential.</p> <p>The submission contends that the level of de-zoning is a threat to the economic stability of Mallow and will limit its potential to function as a ‘Key’ town, major employment centre and a focus for growth in North Cork.</p> <p>Submission welcomes the inclusion of residential reserve. However, given the drastic level of de-zoning and limited residential land supply proposed, it is submitted that there is a need for additional lands to be included in the Residential Reserve, and that such lands should be proximate to the railway station.</p> <p>The submission acknowledges that the entire landholding may not be included under an immediate residential zoning designation, given Mallow’s reduced population target and a greater focus on town centre sites to provide residential units. However, given the site location, close to the town centre and proximate to the railway station that these lands are appropriate to be zoned residential and residential reserve.</p> <p>The submission references the Development Plan Guidelines, paragraph 4.19, advises that “zoning should extend out from the centre of an urban area” stating that it would be premature to consider that these lands do not merit a residential zoning designation due to their close proximity to both Mallow town centre and train station and that the location clearly complies with the Principals of ‘Compact Growth’ and transport orientated development. It contends that the site ought to be viewed as a favourable location for future residential development rather than sites located further away from public transit corridors in order to achieve the targets set out in the Draft Plan for Mallow.</p> <p>With the proposed route for the Northern Relief Road now decided the submission acknowledges that suitable infrastructure upgrades will be required to bring forward the landholding for residential development given the existing access over the former railway bridge. The current provision of access should not be a deciding factor or seen as a deterrent in allocating Medium A residential development zoning and the owners are willing to engage to find an appropriate solution without impeding on what was previously a protected corridor for the proposed relief road.</p> <p>Submission states that they are now in advanced discussions with a developer with the aim of submitting a planning application for residential development on his site.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request for residential zoning and residential reserve on 2 separate parts of landholding at Lacknahoola.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>PJ Buckley</b>
<b>DCDP344233386</b>	DCDP344233386
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission seeks a northerly extension to the development boundary of Grenagh to incorporate the GAA playing fields and playground, in order to acknowledge the intrinsic link between the existing recreational facilities to the north of the village, and the village itself.</p> <p>This submission also seeks the inclusion of the infill landholding between the village and these recreational facilities. The submission considers that these requests are in line with national, regional and local planning policy with respect to compact growth and sustainable development as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extension of boundary will consolidate the existing built form and strengthen the role and function of the village.</li> <li>• represents a logical and orderly extension to the village including the existing GAA playing fields and playground specifically acknowledged in the draft Plan as being important resources for Grenagh.</li> <li>• the boundary extension achieves a balance of residential and community and recreational facilities in line with the policy for Grenagh.</li> <li>• Inclusion identifies with objective DB-01 of the draft Plan which seeks the delivery of up to 40 additional residential units within the lifetime of the Plan.</li> <li>• Inclusion will ensure a compact form, contribute to critical mass of population required to support the development of the village centre in line with policy objectives and support case for further investment in Irish Water services.</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need to extend development boundary of Grenagh to the north and include infill landholding.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are already ample lands within the development boundary of Grenagh to cater for the scale of growth identified over the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Rachel Daly</b>
<b>DCDP328888899</b>	DCDP328888899
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission states that traffic calming measures are necessary at the Limerick end of main street at the T junction close to the Church. There have been a number of accidents at this location as a result of businesses operating in this area and traffic calming is necessary to prevent further accidents.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need for traffic calming in Charleville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Noted. Ongoing public realm improvements continue to take place on main street and other streets in Charleville which will make the town

	centre a more attractive and pedestrian friendly environment. Further consideration can be given to additional improvements such as traffic calming and other infrastructural requirements over the lifetime of the plan where considered necessary.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.4.10.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>RDF Architects &amp; Planning Ltd, on behalf of Mr. Pat Mulcahy</b>
<b>DCDP334544130</b>	DCDP334544130
<b>Submission Summary</b>	The submission seeks a change to zoning on lands from Open Space to Residential at Rockchapel, Co. Cork. A description of the site and its planning history are provided. Issues in relation to access, visual impact, water quality, flooding and location within the Lower Shannon SAC are outlined and addressed. Details of how the development relates to planning policy on rural housing and older persons policy are also outlined. A medical report is enclosed in support of the submission.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Change zoning on lands from Open Space to Residential at Rockchapel.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	These lands are zoned as GC-02 'Open space with provision for flood management and unsuited to development.' This zoning has been in place over a number of plans on the basis of the sites location within the Lower River Shannon SAC and on the basis of its flood risk.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sarah O'Gorman</b>
<b>DCDP346113482</b>	DCDP346113482
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission requests that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan. Considers this road will impact on resident safety and welfare and the reasons outlined for this are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise – Will create an exponential noise increase in a cul de sac. Outlines the health risks of noise quoting the EPA, WHO, etc.</li> <li>• Air pollution – Will bring a huge increase in air pollution to the front doors of residents of the estate who did not purchase their homes in this knowledge.</li> <li>• Safety risks for children – a road poses safety risks for children who regularly play on the green area adjacent to the entrance road. Some houses face directly onto the road where the proposed access road would go through</li> <li>• Traffic management – Access road will create a rat run and bring significant volumes of traffic. There are already significant delays accessing the N20 at peak times and significant congestion would be caused. Concerns over the traffic management system that would need to be put in place and its impact on safety and free flow of traffic.</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity – Access road will result in a depletion of biodiversity along its route. Such habitat provides essential corridors for wildlife and hedgerows represent a carbon sink which can be used as climate mitigation.</li> </ul>



	Accepts the need for a relief road but consider that there are alternative options and substantial greenfield lands at the CV-R-02 and CV-T-02 site which could accommodate an access road in a safer location.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that the CV-U-01 objective for local access/relief road be removed from the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that the retention of this road objective remains necessary and appropriate. It will assist in reducing traffic congestion in the town. The alignment of the route is indicative and specific issues can be addressed at detailed design stage.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Seamus Connolly</b>
<b>DCDP345939961</b>	DCDP345939961
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission requests that the proposed scale of development figure of 10 no. units for Churchtown is reviewed and modified or removed to better reflect the clear potential for residential development within the development boundary over the period 2022-2028, including that which presents itself on their lands, the subject of a previous grant of permission for 55 no. residential units by An Bord Pleanála.</p> <p>The current Local Area Plan allows for the development of 25 no. residential units and the submission states that it is hard to find a reasonable rationale for the proposed reduction particularly in light of national and regional planning policies strongly supporting the development of existing urban locations as the most appropriate places for new development in rural areas and high level Draft Plan objectives in line with same. It notes that the Draft Plan also advises that the wastewater treatment plant's upgrading had been included on the Draft Irish Water Investment Plan 2020-2024 and in this regard it can be considered imminent and should be properly accounted for in a development plan period that runs to 2028.</p> <p>Submission includes a table of examples of where the overall scale of development has been exceeded by individual planning permissions within several different settlements across the county. Overall, it is submitted that the final County Development Plan should not seek to be overly prescriptive in detailing maximum development targets for individual settlements and that these are matters that can be appropriately and successfully resolved in the development management process.</p> <p>The submission highlights that their clients lands have the necessary attributes to facilitate the development of low density housing in a sustainable manner. This submission also includes a site specific flood risk assessment from 2013.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Need to increase scale of development figure for Churchtown.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that greater clarity can be provided on the scale of growth in Key villages.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.7.7.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sean Walsh</b>
<b>DCDP346183620</b>	DCDP346183620
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The landowner requests to have this land zoned for residential use or contained within the Kanturk town development boundary. The lands are located on the western edge of Kanturk Town.</p> <p>It is stated that this would be a natural extension of the boundary as there are already houses in this area. The landowner is proposing to develop the 0.63 hectares of land, with two individual sites, each approx. 0.3 hectare, and each with its own individual wastewater treatment system. Public mains water supply is available to both sites. There are no similar sites to those proposed available for residential development within the town boundary.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Extend development boundary in Kanturk.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	This landholding is c.300 metres west of the current development boundary and within the GB1-2. There are a further c.8 houses between it and the development boundary. It is considered that there is no justification to extend the development boundary of Kanturk this far and that proposals can be considered on their merits within the context of the current zoning and the relevant objectives of the County Development Plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Sirio Investment Management</b>
<b>DCDP345496688</b>	DCDP345496688
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Submission relates to a landholding at Kilnockan and Lacknahoola, Mallow. A detailed planning assessment of the site forms part of the submission. The submission states that their landholding has been designated as "Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses" in the draft CDP. It is requested that the proposed zoning in the draft CDP is amended to 'Existing Mixed / General Business / Industrial Uses', because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be difficult to achieve a high-quality residential development on the site due to its location, site constraints, and neighbouring uses.</li> <li>• The site is not economically viable for residential development.</li> <li>• The previous use of this site was for a service station.</li> <li>• The site's location, attributes and neighbouring uses mean that it is ideally suited to a service station, or comparable business type use.</li> <li>• The site has economic viability for business use and there is a live planning application for a proposed service station.</li> </ul> <p>Submission also refers to a typographical error on tables of p159 section 18.3 of the plan.</p>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Amend zoning in the draft plan to 'Existing Mixed / General Business / Industrial Uses'.

<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	Taking into account the previous commercial use on a portion of the site (now brownfield) and considering that the nature of the surrounding uses are commercial it is considered that the zoning should be changed to Existing Mixed / General Business / Industrial Uses.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	See proposed amendment no. 3.2.3.15.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Ted Bradley</b>
<b>DCDP346300805</b>	DCDP346300805
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>This submission highlights some issues that need to be addressed for the draft plan in relation to Charleville:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questions how the figure of 6,563 for 2028 for Charleville was reached.</li> <li>2. The Local Link which runs from Newcastle West to Charleville should be mentioned in the plan which runs both ways 6 times a day, there is also a feeder bus to the railway station.</li> <li>3. There are only two secondary schools in Charleville. Mannix College closed in 2014 and is used by CETB to run level 3,4 &amp; 5 qqi (Fetac) courses.</li> <li>4. The plan implies that there is good employment in Charleville and the likelihood there will be expansion which is not reflected in the findings of the Community Plan, Charleville, Co Cork 2019-2023 (also attached to this submission for reference). It showed that 2/3 of Charleville households were disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged.</li> <li>5. The Community Plan showed that approximately 20% of the population weren't born in Ireland, higher than the national average. A greater diversity of cultures and people's backgrounds can have significant economic benefits, if realised. There are no provisions/supports in the plan for this section of the Charleville population.</li> <li>6. There is acknowledgement of the increase in cycling however there are currently no cycle paths or cycling facilities to upgrade nor is this mentioned in the plan objectives. There is a need to update page 131.</li> <li>7. Charleville and the surrounding area is mostly flat making cycling as a form of transport attractive. It has good linkage to public transport via buses and trains. Across the border in East Limerick is a cyclehub and renowned Ballyhoura Mountain bike trails. Installing cycling facilities would not alone benefit locals but would be a boost to tourism as shown when the Greenways were established in the Westport area. This development of cycling facilities will help alleviate traffic, will address transport sustainability, it benefits locals and would enhance tourism.</li> <li>8. The wildlife area within the town park has been overlooked in CV-G0-04.</li> <li>9. Questions why Ballysallagh Woods hasn't been designated an area of special conservation.</li> <li>10. Much of the traffic problems in Charleville relate to schools with the exception of Friday evenings. If school going children and their parents felt it was safe to use alternative forms of transport this will significantly reduce this problem.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain how population figure for Charleville was reached.</li> <li>2. Update text regarding transport services.</li> <li>3. Update text regarding secondary schools in Charleville.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. A high level of households are disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged in Charleville.</li> <li>5. A greater diversity of cultures and people's backgrounds can have significant economic benefits, if realised. There are no provisions/supports in the plan for this section of the Charleville population.</li> <li>6. Currently no cycle facilities in Charleville.</li> <li>7. Benefits of cycling infrastructure for Charleville include transport sustainability, tourism, etc.</li> <li>8. Reference needed to the wildlife area in the park.</li> <li>9. Need to protect Ballysallagh woods as an amenity</li> <li>10. Need for alternative forms of transport to schools to tackle traffic problems.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Core Strategy figures have been revised. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.</li> <li>2. Noted. It is proposed to include reference.</li> <li>3. Noted. It is proposed to include reference.</li> <li>4. Noted. The vision for Charleville as a Main Town in North Cork is to expand its population and encourage the expansion and diversification of its employment and service base aiming to make it a more balanced and sustainable live/work destination while further capitalising on its strategic position and connectivity between the Cork and Limerick Metropolitan Areas along the Atlantic Economic Corridor. Achieving such a vision it is hoped can lead to further investment in and increase opportunities for disadvantaged areas.</li> <li>5. Noted. This not a matter for a land use plan.</li> <li>6. Noted. It is proposed to amend text.</li> <li>7. Noted. It is proposed to include additional text.</li> <li>8. Amendment proposed to include reference to wildlife role of town park.</li> <li>9. Ballysallagh woods is considered to be an area of local biodiversity. It is now proposed to include within a green infrastructure zoning.</li> <li>10. Policy and objectives in the draft plan continue to support the provision and improvement of sustainable forms of travel.</li> </ol>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	A number of amendments are proposed in relation to the above – see no. 3.2.4.10, 3.2.4.3, 3.2.4.4 and 3.2.4.12.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>The Planning Partnership</b>
<b>DCDP346257512</b>	DCDP346257512
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission recognises the draft plans proposal to zone specific lands NK-C-02 in Newmarket. It notes that the proposed NK-C-02 Specific Development Objective does not acknowledge the potential to development the site as Age Friendly Neighbourhood with associated Living Accommodation.

	<p>Project Ireland 2040 recognises that the number of people aged over 65 will more than double by 2040, making up 23% of the population. It is widely recognised that our older people will want to stay independent and live in their own communities for as long as possible.</p> <p>The Newmarket Scarteen Lower Age Friendly Neighbourhood Masterplan and Urban Design Strategy, have the potential to be an Age Friendly pilot scheme for Cork County Council that may assist in enabling Newmarket Town gain Age Friendly Town Recognition.</p> <p>The design of an Age Friendly neighbourhood at this centrally located site within proximity to Newmarket Town Centre, Teach Altra Nursing Home and the Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses through a Masterplan and Age Friendly Urban Design Strategy, will facilitate Cork County Council in meeting some of the needs of the elderly in Newmarket and will enhance and strengthen the physical and social fabric of the town.</p> <p>The submission specifically requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Age Friendly Living Accommodation be included as Appropriate Uses in Community Areas under the Community (C) of 18.3 Land Use Zoning Categories of the Draft Plan Volume One (draft text is included)</li> <li>• That Age Friendly Living Accommodation through a Masterplan and Age Friendly Urban Design Strategy be included for under NK-C-02 Specific Development Objective for Newmarket (draft text is included).</li> </ul>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	<p>That Age Friendly Living Accommodation be included as Appropriate Uses in Community Areas under the Community (C) of 18.3 Land Use Zoning Categories of the Draft Plan Volume One (draft text is included).</p> <p>That Age Friendly Living Accommodation through a Masterplan and Age Friendly Urban Design Strategy be included for under NK-C-02 Specific Development Objective for Newmarket (draft text is included).</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	<p>Sheltered housing, generally considered as comparable with age friendly living accommodation, is already listed as an appropriate use in community areas, as set out in Chapter 18 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The specific zoning objective of the site already makes provision for sheltered housing or similar facilities.</p>
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>The Right Reverend Monsignor O'Brien</b>
<b>DCDP346220386</b>	DCDP346220386
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>Within the settlement area of Ballyhea the current County Development Plan makes provision for 5 new houses. In the draft development plan this provision has risen to 'up to 10' new houses. However, this increased number of houses does not take account of suitable building land - the amount of which is expected to decrease significantly should proposed road realignments be carried into effect and should no flood barriers be erected to prevent flooding within the defined settlement area. It would seem more coherent to retain the current provision of 5 houses into the new development plan.</p>

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Reduce scale of growth from 10 to 5 in Ballyhea.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is not proposed to change the scale of growth for Ballyhea, as it is not considered excessive.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Thomas Stack</b>
<b>DCDP345655317</b>	DCDP345655317
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Request that lands in the Ironmines, Spa Glen, Mallow be zoned for medium density housing This is appropriate as it adjoins other medium density developments and is accessible to the preferred route for the N72/73 bypass/active travel corridor which would allow for future residents to have easy pedestrian and cycling access to Mallow town centre. It therefore supports low carbon travel.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Request that lands are zoned for residential.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Turnkey Developments Limited</b>
<b>DCDP346209512</b>	DCDP346209512
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks the inclusion of lands to the west of Charleville within the development boundary as a residential zoning. It notes that these lands were previously zoned and that there has been an application submitted for 45 houses which covers the majority of the land. The submission states that all services are available to the site and that the lower part of the site which contains a small pond and marsh can be retained as a new bio-diversity park which could be transferred to the council if required. Submission notes that there are many amenities and services in Charleville in close proximity to the site that future residents can enjoy.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Include residential zoning in Charleville.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned to cater for the population targets as set out in the core strategy. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Tim Lenihan</b>
<b>DCDP340891385</b>	DCDP340891385
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Submission seeks the zoning of lands for residential to the North West of Kanturk. It states that these lands were zoned in the 2003 County Development Plan and that the lands are appropriate to development and serviceable.

<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Include residential zoning North West of Kanturk.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are already ample lands identified within the Kanturk development boundary to cater for housing needs identified over the plan period. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Watfore Ltd</b>
<b>DCDP346109092</b>	DCDP346109092
<b>Submission Summary</b>	Requests consideration to the function of, and policy environment for, the subject lands at Ballyvorisheen, to be reviewed and finalised on foot of the confirmation of the N72/N73 corridor.
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Consider the potential of lands at Ballyvorisheen.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that adequate lands have been zoned in Mallow for the period of this plan. See Key Issue in Volume One, Part One of this Report.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.
<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Willie Murphy,</b>
<b>DCDP346442735</b>	DCDP346442735
<b>Submission Summary</b>	<p>The submitter fully supports any further expansion of zoning into his lands which could be made available for immediate development. It states he has provided lands in the past for the development of houses in Grenagh (as indicated on attached map). Supporting points include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expansion of the village to the east would consolidate the existing developed area.</li> <li>2. The lands are bounded by existing roads to the North and South.</li> <li>3. There is a legal obligation on the owner of the lands adjoining to the west to provide full connectivity to the village.</li> <li>4. He owns lands on all sides of the existing Council waste-water treatment plant. It is noted that an expansion of this facility is necessary and this could be facilitated.</li> <li>5. Lands generally fall to the east and are suitable for gravity drainage to the treatment plant and disposal of surface water to the River Martin.</li> <li>6. Grenagh is ideally placed to grow substantially in the near future with new motorway and planned commuter rail system linking Cork to Mallow.</li> </ol>
<b>Principal Issues Raised</b>	Extend development boundary at Grenagh.
<b>Chief Executive's Response</b>	It is considered that there are already ample lands within the development boundary of Grenagh to cater for the scale of growth identified over the lifetime of the plan.
<b>Chief Executive's Recommendation</b>	No change proposed.







Comhairle Contae Chorcaí  
Cork County Council