



# Cork County Development Plan Review

## **Section 12(8) Chief Executive's Report**

Volume II: Chief Executive's Responses and Recommendations • 30<sup>th</sup> October 2014





# Contents

	Page
<b>Section 2(a)(i) Chief Executive's Response to the Submissions from the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government and South and East Regional Authority</b>	4
<b>Section 2(a)(ii) All other Submissions (by interested party A-Z)</b>	10

## Section 2(a) (i): Submissions from the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government and the South and East Regional Assembly

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
Department of Environment, Community and Local Government dCDP14/1987	1. Notes uncertainties over whether the population targets for certain towns can be accommodated without giving rise to adverse effects on Natura sites. 2. Core Strategy should be altered to identify the future population levels and associated housing land or dwelling numbers required at an LAP level. 3. Draft plan should set out a sufficiently clear and robust approach to deal with surpluses of land zoning identified. Notes that an extra 207ha of strategic reserve lands is proposed in the Metropolitan area and that this is not tied to a specific location. 4. The amount of zoned land/housing must be in line with the amount of land or housing specified in the RPGs. Requested to; (i) Show where the 50%	1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to identify the future population levels and associated housing land or dwelling numbers required at an LAP level?  2. Should the proposed amendments be modified to set out a clear and robust approach to dealing with any surpluses of zoned land identified?  3. Should the proposed amendments be modified to ensure that the amount of zoned land/housing is in line with Regional Planning Guidelines?  4. Should the proposed amendments be modified to give a full explanation of how figures under heading "Total new Households 2011-2022" were calculated?	1 to 5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" "Housing Supply"	1 to 5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy" "Housing Supply"

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>headroom figure is. (ii) Deal with any housing land surpluses identified. (iii) Identify all locations of anticipated growth.</p> <p>5. Table 2.2 and accompanying text are much clearer now. However a full explanation of how figures under heading "Total new Households 2011-2022" were calculated is required.</p> <p>6. Key indicators for monitoring are welcomed.</p> <p>7. Council requested to make the required changes in accordance with Section 12(10) of the Principle Act, as amended.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Department of Environment, Community and Local Government dCDP14/</p>	<p>1. Query the legislative scope for this second notice/amendment process (<u>Proposed Amendment to the Draft County Development Plan 2013 – Proposed Change No. 10.17 Objective TM 5-2 Cork and Other Ports.</u> ) as it pertains to the ‘material amendment stage’ of the Plan making process. In this regard, Section 12 (7) of the Planning and Development Act, as amended, provides for an amendment process (material amendments) to a Development Plan, in the singular. The Act does not appear to provide for nor anticipate ‘multiple’ notices / amendment procedures at this stage of the plan making process, although it shouldn’t rule out the exceptional option of withdrawing the notice and reissuing an amended notice in the interest of clarity and transparency, notwithstanding the legislative timeframe.</p> <p>2. Suggests that the approach taken by the Council gives rise to</p>	<p>1. In respect of the detail/content of the proposed amendment to the Plan, the Department has no substantive observations to the proposed amendment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>confusion for the public/interested parties/prescribed bodies, who, having commented on/participated in, the first set of material amendments to the Draft Plan, under Section 12 (7) of the Act, would not be anticipating a second set of amendments and may reasonably assume that they had fulfilled their role/statutory functions with respect to the 'material amendment stage' of the plan making process; and sets a precedent for multiple amendment processes in the future from Cork County Council and other Council's – a situation which clearly is not in keeping with the spirit of the legislation.</p> <p>3.Concerned that the wording of the public notices relating to Proposed Change No.10.17 could give rise to confusion in particular in relation to SEA.</p>			

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



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
Southern & Eastern Regional Assembly CDP14/1967	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommendations made to improve the alignment between provisions in the NSS, RPGs and the sustainable development of the county.</li> <li>2. Confirm if the "Net Ha Estimated Requirement" figure in Table 2.2 is in line with the net land requirements as per Table 4.6 of the SW RPG.</li> <li>3. Is the "Estimated Strategic Reserve" surplus zoned land and whether includes 50% headroom or not.</li> <li>4. Show how intend to deal with any surplus lands.</li> <li>5. Explain the basis of the 360ha strategic land reserve required for Metropolitan Cork.</li> <li>6. Identify key areas likely to be developed over lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>7. Clarify where it is intended the majority of future growth will be targeted to.</li> <li>8. How were figures for villages and rural areas calculated?</li> <li>9. Provide separate population</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to confirm if the "Net Ha Estimated Requirement" figure in Table 2.2 is in line with the net land requirements as per Table 4.6 of the SW RPG?</li> <li>2. Should the proposed amendments be modified to clarify the amount of surplus zoned land and whether this is headroom or not?</li> <li>3. Should the proposed amendments be modified to show how going to address surplus lands?</li> <li>4. Should the proposed amendments be modified to explain the basis of the requirement for a minimum 360ha strategic reserve in Metropolitan Cork?</li> <li>5. Should the proposed amendments be modified to identify key areas likely to be developed?</li> <li>6. Should the proposed amendments be modified to show where the majority of future growth will be targeted to?</li> <li>7. Should the proposed amendments be modified to show how figures for</li> </ol>	1 to 7 See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"	1 to 7 See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>figures for villages and rural areas at a Municipal District level.</p> <p>10. What indicators are to be used to monitor the plans progress and implementation?</p> <p>11. List of indicators should include aims, objectives, targets, units of measurement, data sources, presentation of data and expected outputs.</p>	<p>villages and rural areas were calculated and show separate population figures for villages and rural areas at a Municipal District level?</p> <p>8. Should the proposed amendments be modified to give much greater detail about the way the plans progress and implementation are to be monitored?</p>	<p>8. It is intended to prepare a monitoring strategy based on the indicators identified in the plan to be in place when the plan becomes operational.</p>	<p>8. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>



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

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Agar Jeff and Croonenberg Carlien PAdCDP14/1970</p>	<p>1. Reference is made to paragraph 9.3.1.4 'the cumulative effect of wind energy developments with regard to landscape and visual impacts and also on Natura 2000 sites which should also be a consideration' in this submission and it states the importance of including additional text acknowledging those developments that have already been accepted but are yet to be implemented be added to the amendment. 2. It continues by stating that an environmental impact survey was carried out in their area before the implementation of a wind farm development only a few kilometres away at Shehy More and another one near Inchigeela village which is quite close by. 3. Expectation that the neighbouring wind farms effects in their area are considered in an holistic way to avoid project splitting by wind farm developers as per the terms of the European</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that additional text is included acknowledging those developments that have already been permitted but have not yet being implemented?  2. Should the proposed amendment be modified to ensure that the cumulative effect of wind farm developments is adequately addressed?</p>	<p>1. Cumulative impacts are one of the key policy considerations identified in the development of this wind energy strategy and associated objectives and is also considered in Paragraph 9.3.14 which states ‘ The cumulative effect of wind energy developments with regard to landscape and visual impacts and also impacts on Natura 2000 Sites will also be considered’.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>impact assessments directive and that all of the neighbouring projects would be considered for their cumulative effect on the nature and landscape of our area.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>An Taisce PAdCDP10.1714/1994</p>	<p>1) Objective TM 5-2: Cork and Other Ports unjustified, having regard to a previous refusal for plans at Ringaskiddy by An Bord Pleanala under PL04.PA0003; and 2) Premature, when considering the current undecided application currently before An Bord Pleanala under Ref: PL 04. PA 0035. It states that the inappropriateness of policy objectives in many instances becomes a reality when projects are assessed by ABP.</p> <p>The Board routinely disregards objectives of a Development Plan which are not in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and refuses planning permission. This undermines confidence in the planning system and leads to misplaced investment decisions by private investors, significant costs, and conflicts with local communities and is ultimately counterproductive.</p>	<p>1. Is it appropriate to include an Objective like TM 5-2 into the County Development Plan?</p>	<p>1. The inclusion or otherwise of Objective TM 5-2 in the CDP is not the subject of this proposed amendment, as it only relates to the inclusion of some additional text. Therefore whether or not the Objective should be included does not form part of this public consultation.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Ballyvolane Development Company Ltd PAdCDP14/1982</p>	<p>1. Submission relating to the Ballyvolane Masterplan states that it is clear that it is the Council’s objective to proactively support the development of the Ballyvolane X-01 ‘masterplan’ lands and that housing units will need to come on stream by 2018 which would conservatively mean commencing construction in 2016.</p> <p>2. Welcomes the Council’s objectives for the X-01 land in Ballyvolane and its recognition that it is critical for the lands to be made ready for the commencement of development during the years 2017-2019.</p> <p>3. The proposal for a District Centre in Ballyvolane will help support and provide some of the critical infrastructure required for the development of the ‘X-01’ lands and also provide the necessary facilities and services to provide for the sustainable development of the area and the wider retail catchment area.</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment to the Draft Plan be modified to address specific issues raised relating to the Ballyvolane Masterplan?</p>	<p>The key infrastructure requirements for this area have been identified in revised Table 15.1. All the issues raised will be addressed in detail in the preparation of the Ballyvolane Framework Masterplan Study which will inform the next LAP review.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Baltimore Properties Ltd. PAdCDP14/1990</p>	<p>Express reservations with the decision to include the former Fishery School site/building and slipway in the amendments to the Draft RPS for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no precedent for this decision and would appreciate some clarity on the grounds for said decision on the basis of the Categories of Special Interest as outlined in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines 2011</li> <li>2. Clarification is sought from the Council on the merits of the proposed addition of this structure to the RPS. Building is not recommended for protection on the NIAH.</li> <li>3. Neither has it been recommended for protection by Ministerial Direction.</li> <li>4. In the absence of the details of merit as to the characteristics of special interest which would merit its inclusion, we request that the Former Fishery School Site/ Buildings and Slipway be omitted from the Record of Protected Structures.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the proposed amendment putting the Former Fishery School Site/ Buildings and Slipway be on the Record of Protected Structures be omitted.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This structure is considered to have special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific or technical interest.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</li> </ol>



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
Baltimore Properties Ltd. PAdCDP14/1991	Duplicate 14/1990	Duplicate 14/1990	Duplicate 14/1990	Duplicate 14/1990
Bartholomew Cooney Estate PAdCDP14/1979	<p>1. Submission on behalf of landowners within the X-01 site welcomes the fact that the Council has published a timetable for the completion of the Shannon park Masterplan and wishes to inform the Council that they will be making a detailed submission to the Master plan process in the near future.</p> <p>2. States that they would be very grateful to meet and discuss proposals further with the Council and be kept informed of any developments in relation to the Master plan process.</p>	<p>1. Support for publishing a timetable for the completion of the Shannon park Framework Masterplan Study.</p>	1. Noted.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
Bowen Mamie Monkstown, Glenbrook, Branch of Chase PAdCDP14/1999	Requests that if Objective TM 5-2 is to be included it must acknowledge, support and protect the visual amenity, tourism, residential amenity particularly recreation amenity( including the expectations of the stakeholders) for the impacts of potential port	Should the proposed amendment to the Draft Plan be modified to revise CDP Objective TM 5-2 so it acknowledges, supports and protects the visual amenity, tourism, residential amenity particularly recreation amenity( including the expectations of the stakeholders)	Objective TM 5-2 is also linked to Objective EE 6-2 and it is considered that the two objectives when read together provide adequate protection to all residential amenity, tourism, and recreational uses around the harbour.	Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>development in Monkstown Bay/Ringaskiddy as consideration already given to Marino Point.</p> <p>It continues by outlining the following concerns;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Lower Harbour from Monkstown downstream is far more widely used for recreation and is far more developed with the new Marina and the expansion plans.</li> <li>2. The course marks for M.B.S.C. are attached and the submission states that they would be greatly impacted by the Container Port moving into the already shared waters of Monkstown Bay.</li> <li>3. Considered inappropriate that a planning authority would promote the commercial development of a new container port by the Port of Cork to a specific site given that Monkstown listed as an</li> </ol>	<p>for the impacts of potential port development in Monkstown Bay/Ringaskiddy as consideration already given to Marino Point.</p>		

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	Architectural Conservation Area, with amenities, plus a special protected area for bird.			
Brookfield Renewable Ireland PAdCDP14/1976	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that there should not be restrictions on development in Natura 2000 sites as considers the exclusion of these areas contrary to specific EU Commission advice on implementation of Natura 2000 regulations?	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that there should not be restrictions on development in Natura 2000 sites as considers the exclusion of these areas contrary to specific EU Commission advice on implementation of Natura 2000 regulations?	1. The Draft Plan does not propose a blanket prohibition on wind energy developments in Natura 2000 sites however it does indicate that within these areas the standards are set much higher given their environmental sensitivities and the fact that other alternative more suitable less environmentally sensitive sites are available.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
Buckley Geraldine PAdCDP14/1971	1. Proposes that the planning guidelines re local public consultation be made a mandatory procedure in order to uphold the ARHUS Convention. 2. Given the increase in the applications for wind farms of disproportionate and commercial development size in close proximity	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to provide guidelines making public consultation a mandatory procedure in order to uphold the ARHUS Convention?  2. Should the Planning Acts be amended to allow for colour coded	1. It is considered that the Planning Acts in relation to development management and plan making make sufficient provision for public consultation.  2. This is a matter for national legislation.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>to rural homes, that the Planning Acts should be amended to allow a system where planning notices would be colour coded, to alert local communities to applications for commercial developments at the time of application.</p> <p>3.The development management chapter and the map number pertaining to the new map outlining the areas suitable for wind farms (over 50% proposed for North Cork)without public consultation is not in keeping with the best interest of the local environment and good practice for future environmental development.</p>	<p>planning notices, to alert local communities to applications for commercial developments at the time of application.</p> <p>3. Should the proposed amendment be modified to reduce the areas considered suitable for wind farms, which is over 50% proposed in North Cork.</p>	<p>3. Any proposals in the “Open to Consideration” and “Acceptable in Principle” areas have to comply with the safeguards set out in Objectives ED 3-4 and ED 3-5. Not all sites within these areas will be considered suitable for wind farm developments.</p>	<p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>3. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>
<p>Cork Harbour Alliance for Responsible Development (CHARD)</p> <p>PAdCDP14/2002</p>	<p>Concerned that the value of the Ringaskiddy/Monkstown Bay Area as a residential, recreational and tourist amenity has been ignored in the proposed amendment/change No. 10.17 to Objective TM 5-2.</p> <p>The following concerns are also outlined;</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment be modified so that the value of the Ringaskiddy/Monkstown Bay Area as a residential, recreational and tourist amenity is included in Objective TM 5-2.</p>	<p>Objective TM 5-2 is also linked to Objective EE 6-2 and it is considered that the two objectives when read together provide adequate protection to all residential amenity, tourism, and recreational uses around the harbour.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>1. Such areas are offered whatever protection available to ensure their ongoing use by the communities who live and recreate there.</p> <p>2. Cork County Council has decided that the proposed change No. 10.17, Objective TM 5-2 would not warrant a full Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Requests that this proposed change be rejected by Cork County Council in the interest of proper and sustainable planning and the greater good.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Cork Chamber PAdCDP14/1977</p>	<p>1. Welcomes the commitment to include additional provisions for monitoring population targets and resultant infrastructure requirements over the lifetime of the Plan and to amend the Plan to consider the co-location of convenience retail in areas of significant workforce populations. 2. Requests that a statement is incorporated within the Plan which commits to implementing engagement structures that support stronger strategic alliances with local authorities and other key actors across the Atlantic Gateways Initiative regions on joint strategic planning priorities to ensure optimum and timely delivery of infrastructure that supports economic development (e.g. telecoms; road/ports infrastructure for agri-exports). 3. Requests that joint strategies are developed with Cork City Council on key planning areas that require an integrated regional approach - i.e., need for a joint tourism strategy; a joint telecoms/data</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to incorporate a statement within the Plan which commits to implementing engagement structures on joint strategic planning priorities?  2. Should the proposed amendments be modified to take account of the outcomes and recommendations of the Regional Spatial and Economic Plans and LECPs?</p>	<p>1. It is considered that the CDP already allows for strong linkages with local and strategic initiatives.  2. It is considered that when the Regional Spatial and Economic Plan is finalised it may be necessary to amend this plan. The LECP are currently being prepared and will be informed by and contribute to the wider suite of national, regional and local strategies.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.  2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>strategy and a joint strategic messaging strategy.</p> <p>4. Needs to be scope within the CDP to take account of the outcomes and recommendations of the Regional Spatial and Economic Plans and LECs.</p>			
<p>Cork City Council PAdCDP14/1980</p>	<p>1. Suggests that there is more than sufficient land zoned to cater for likely future needs to 2022 and beyond in Metropolitan Cork.</p> <p>2. Suggests that any review of the zoned land supply should only be considered in line with the sequence of reviews/publications set out in the Joint Housing Strategy.</p> <p>3. Proposal would give a very negative signal to the housing market and create expectations and pressure to zone land in more unsustainable locations. 4.</p>	<p>1. Should the Proposed Amendments be modified to omit the proposed additional strategic reserve in Metropolitan Cork?</p> <p>2. Should the Proposed Amendment 7.2 be modified to make a minor change to Table 7.2 Retail Floorspace Distribution?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"</p> <p>2. Proposed Amendment PC 7.2 should be modified to make a minor change with the insertion of the word "Centre" into Table 7.2.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"</p> <p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment with Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>Requests that the proposed additional strategic reserve be omitted. 6. Supports proposals to improve delivery of infrastructure and to prioritise preparation of masterplans. 7. Requests a clarification of the revised Table 7.2 Retail Floorspace Distribution, Proposed Change 7.2.</p>			



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Cork Harbour Environmental Protection Association (CHEPA) PAdCDP10.1714/1993</p>	<p>Notes that validating and adopting the objectives by CCC without realisation of the importance of Cork Harbour would not reflect good and sustainable planning policy. It states that ABP were correct to refuse permission to the Port of Cork in 2008 to move their Container Terminal to Ringaskiddy. The following concerns outlined;</p> <p>1) An acceptance of the Port's intentions via objectives proposed is contrary to the Planning Authority's function.</p> <p>2) Cost to replace the existing N28 considered a burden to the taxpayer.</p> <p>3) Negative impact implications (human, social amenity and wildlife) of re-location are not stated in the Objectives.</p> <p>4) CCC has not given due cognisance to the submissions presented by resident harbour stakeholders at the hearing nor</p>	<p>1) Objective TM 5-2 expresses consideration for the residential amenity, tourism and recreation around Marino Point, it makes no mention of the more developed residential amenity, tourism and recreation around Ringaskiddy</p>	<p>1. Objective TM 5-2 is also linked to Objective EE 6-2 and it is considered that the two objectives when read together provide adequate protection to all residential amenity, tourism, and recreational uses around the harbour.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>reflected on necessity to conduct an in-depth study on the merits of such a re-location, other than the commercial advantages.</p> <p>5) Objective TM 5-2 expresses consideration for the residential amenity, tourism and recreation around Marino Point; it makes no mention of the more developed residential amenity, tourism and recreation around Ringaskiddy. It is incumbent on any planning authority to give consideration to these and any other impacts a future development could have on its surrounding environment including Monkstown, Cobh and surrounding area with a well developed tourist trade.</p> <p>6) Inappropriate for a planning authority to promote a commercial development, as CCC has done for the Port of Cork.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
D’Alton Marcia PAdCDP14/2001	The proposed change to Objective TM5-2 conveys the impression that a road upgrade is the primary issue of concern with regard to the Port of Cork's relocation to Ringaskiddy, whilst regard for residential amenity, tourism and recreation concerns are the primary concern with regard to the Port's potential relocation to Marino Point. The reality is that road upgrades, residential amenity, recreation and tourism concerns are relevant to the Port's relocation to both Ringaskiddy and Marino Point.	Should the Proposed Amendment to TM 5-2 be modified to include reference to roads in regards to Marino Point and residential amenity, tourism and recreation in relation to Ringaskiddy?	Objective TM 5-2 is also linked to Objective EE 6-2 and it is considered that the two objectives when read together provide adequate protection to all residential amenity, tourism, and recreational uses around the harbour. Specific roads issues relating to Ringaskiddy (N28) and Marino Point (R624) are addressed in Chapter 10 Transport and Chapter 15 Putting the Plan into Practice.	Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Dawn Meats &amp; Paul Moore PAdCDP14/1972</p>	<p>Submission relating to the Water-Rock Masterplan (MP).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests that the proposed neighbourhood centre be relocated further north and reduce the size/scale and states that the requirements for non-commercial uses to be provided within the centre are onerous.</li> <li>2. Relocate the schools away from centre of the MP, so that they adjoin the linear park.</li> <li>3. Requests that the “Business Uses” in Character Area 7 be removed from the MP and that this area be rezoned this area for “High Density Mixed Use / Residential” use.</li> </ol>	<p>Should the proposed amendment to the Draft Plan be modified to address specific issues raised relating to the Water-Rock Masterplan?</p>	<p>The key infrastructure requirements for this area have been identified in revised Table 15.1. All the issues raised will be addressed in detail in the preparation of the Water -Rock Framework Masterplan Study which will inform the next LAP review.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>4. In relation to residential densities, the same flexibility provided for in the 2009 CDP should also be allowed for in the final adopted MP for Water Rock and a greater proportion of lands should also be zoned for medium density use in the final adopted MP.</p> <p>5. Subject lands should be included within the first phase of the MP.</p> <p>6. Avoid significant infrastructural costs and associated onerous general; supplementary (rail) and special development contribution costs, which in turn would act as a disincentive and disadvantage of developing in the Water Rock area.</p> <p>7. Introduce a separate Section 48 General Contributions Scheme for the Water Rock area with reduced contribution rates to encourage development in accordance with the provisions of Development Contributions - Draft Guidelines.</p>			
<p>Dawn Meats &amp; Paul Moore PAdCDP14/1973</p>	<p>Submission relating to the WaterRock Masterplan (MP)</p> <p>1. Requests that the proposed neighbourhood centre be relocated</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment to the Draft Plan be modified to address specific issues raised relating to the Water-Rock Masterplan?</p>	<p>The key infrastructure requirements for this area have been identified in revised Table 15.1. All the issues raised will be addressed in detail in the</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>further north and reduce the size/scale and states that the requirements for non-commercial uses to be provided within the centre are onerous.</p> <p>2. Relocate the schools away from centre of the MP, so that they adjoin the linear park.</p> <p>3. Requests that the “Business Uses” in Character Area 7 be removed from the MP and that this area be rezoned this area for “High Density Mixed Use / Residential” use.</p> <p>4. In relation to residential densities, the same flexibility provided for in the 2009 CDP should also be allowed for in the final adopted MP for Water Rock and a greater proportion of lands should also be zoned for medium density use in the final adopted MP.</p> <p>5. Subject lands should be included within the first phase of the MP.</p> <p>6. Avoid significant infrastructural costs and associated onerous general; supplementary (rail) and special development contribution costs, which in turn would act as a</p>		<p>preparation of the Water-Rock Framework Masterplan Study which will inform the next LAP review.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	disincentive and disadvantage of developing in the Water Rock area. 7. Introduce a separate Section 48 General Contributions Scheme for the Water Rock area with reduced contribution rates to encourage development in accordance with the provisions of Development Contributions - Draft Guidelines.			
Dawn Meats & Paul Moore PAdCDP14/1974	Duplicate of 14/1972 and 14/1973	Duplicate of 14/1972 and 14/1973	Duplicate of 14/1972 and 14/1973	Duplicate of 14/1972 and 14/1973
Dublin Airport Authority PAdCDP14/2003	Welcome the proposed amendment TM 5-2 a) to ensure that strategic facilities at Cork Airport have appropriate road transport capacity to facilitate their sustainable development in future years.	The Dublin Airport Authority welcome the proposed amendment TM 5-2 a).	Noted.	Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
de Haas Pamela PAdCDP14/1944	1. This submission makes reference to Proposed Amendment 9.4. “Open to Consideration” areas and revised text of Para 9.3.14. It states that the text “High design standards in terms of	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to provide adequate protection to Natura 2000 sites?	1. All Natura 2000 sites are located within “Normally Discouraged Areas” to ensure that wind farm developments will not give rise to adverse impacts on ecologically	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>environmental protection measures” is a rather loose aspiration that does not adequately protect the sensitivity associated with impacts on Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>2. States that the requirement for bunding of lubricants, coolants etc. that are temporarily stored on wind turbine construction sites (as conditioned into several CCC planning conditions over the past number of years) is as risky as when those same liquids are pumped into an elevated nacelle with the risk of dispersal is much greater due to both the elevation and the prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>3. Makes reference to Revised Text of Objective ED 3-5 which applies to commercial wind energy development that are ‘open to consideration’ is conditional (amongst others) on being in those areas where proposals can avoid adverse impacts on visual quality of the landscape and the degree to which impacts are highly visible over wider areas. However, it does not reference the cumulative effect</p>	<p>2. Should the Revised Text of Objective ED 3-5 which applies to commercial wind energy development that are ‘open to consideration’ make reference to the cumulative effect of existing installed wind energy and that which has already been approved?</p>	<p>sensitive sites.</p> <p>2. The cumulative impact of existing and permitted wind farm developments is a normal planning consideration which will be taken into account in any assessment of any new proposals.</p>	<p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	of existing installed wind energy and that which has already been approved, but not yet installed. See CCC Planning Ref. 11/00318 and associated ABP Decision PL 88.240461.			
de Haas Pamela PAdCDP14/1945	Makes reference to proposed change 9.6, amendment of Objective ED 3-7. The submission proposes that the last line in this objective, “can be avoided”, should apply to all bullet points.	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to include additional text ‘can be avoided’ to all bullet points in Objective 3-7?	1. The text “can be avoided” is intended to apply to all the bullet points in Objective ED 3-7.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
de Haas Pamela PAdCDP14/1946	‘Electricity networks’ and amendment reference is 9.10.  Revised text of Para 9.6.2 - In the context of electricity networks, inclusion of the text “Ensure that the maximum possible separation from dwelling houses is maintained” would assist in allaying the concerns of the public.	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that text dealing with electricity networks is further strengthened so as to ensure that the maximum possible separation from dwelling houses is maintained?	1. It is considered that the revised Objective ED 6-2 provides adequate protection of residential amenities.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
de Haas Pamela PAdCDP14/1947	Objective ED 6-2 - Minimising the proximity of transmission lines and associated substations to people’s houses is a key consideration. There are many examples of concerted protests to this issue over the past decade, and the ‘Anti-	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to minimising the proximity of transmission lines and associated substations to residential dwellings?	1. It is considered that the revised Objective ED 6-2 provides adequate protection of residential amenities.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	Pylon Campaign’ on the proposed Cork-Dublin interconnector is ongoing.			
de Haas, Nigel PAdCDP14/1953	<p>1. Proposed Change 9.4 – new text proposed to the end of paragraph 9.3.14 as follows;</p> <p>2. Revised text of objective ED 3-5 – (1) additional text ‘cumulative or’ in last paragraph. Proposed Change 9.6,</p> <p>3. Revised text of objective 3-7 as per comment. Last line ‘can be avoided’ should apply to all bullet points.</p> <p>4. Proposed Change 9.10 – new text proposed to Paragraph 9.6.2; ensure that the maximum possible separation from dwelling houses is maintained’.</p> <p>5. Proposed Change 9.11. Additional text of objective ‘or in close proximity to dwelling houses’ in first paragraph.</p> <p>6. It was also noted that the disproportionate concentration of ‘Acceptable in Principle’ areas in the vicinity of Skibbereen to Dunmanway and the Gearagh. However, since this is not the</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to include additional text to the end of paragraph 9.3.14 and additional text to objective ED 3-5 as considered that the cumulative effect of wind farm developments has not been adequately addressed?</p> <p>2. Should the amendment to Objective ED 3-7 be modified to include “can be avoided” after each bullet point?</p> <p>3. Should the proposed amendments be modified to add additional text to wind energy objectives to further protect residential amenities?</p>	<p>1. Cumulative impacts are one of the key policy consideration identified in the development of this wind energy strategy and associated objectives and is also considered in Paragraph 9.3.14 which states ‘ The cumulative effect of wind energy developments with regard to landscape and visual impacts and also impacts on Natura 2000 Sites will also be considered.</p> <p>2. The text “can be avoided” is intended to apply to all the bullet points in Objective ED 3-7.</p> <p>3. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>3. Adopt Proposed</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>subject of an amendment it does not appear to be open to submission at this time.</p>		<p>distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration. Revisions to these Guidelines will be finalised and issued to planning authorities under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).</p>	<p>Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht PAdCDP14/1988</p>	<p>1. Identifies the critical conservation issues as; ensure that further development in settlements in the upper part of the Blackwater River (i.e. upstream of Mallow); settlements discharging into the Great Island Channel SAC; discharging into Bandon River SAC downstream of Dunmanway and upgrading of the R624 Cobh Road; will not adversely affect Natura Sites.</p> <p>2. Welcomes the putting on hold of any development which would have an adverse impact on Natura Sites until after completion of an appropriate assessment and upgrading of treatment plants/discharge infrastructure.</p> <p>3. If Proposed Amendments 2.3 and 11.8 are not adopted then an adverse impact cannot be ruled out in the river catchments identified above.</p> <p>4. If Proposed Amendment 10.10 is not adopted then cannot rule out an adverse impact from the upgrading the R624 Cobh Road.</p>	<p>1. Provided development which would cause an adverse impact is put on hold and Proposed Amendments 2.3, 10.10 and 11.8 are adopted there should be no adverse impact on the Natura Sites identified as been at possible risk.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1(b) “Core Strategy” “Population Growth targets for Sensitive Water“</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1(b) “Core Strategy” “Population Growth targets for Sensitive Water Catchments”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht PAdCDP14/1997</p>	<p>This submission relates to the two clauses introduced to objective TM 5-2 as follows;</p> <p>(1)Qualifying support for port relocation to Ringaskiddy, by having regard for a significant improvement to the road network. No reason to doubt that the improvement of the access road network (from the N25 to Ringaskiddy) can be accommodated without significant effects on the Cork Harbour SPA. No issues in relation to the relevant SPA, pNHA, nature reserves or knows listed protected species which occur in the area which cannot be avoided or mitigated against.</p> <p>(2)Residential amenity, tourism and recreation will be taken into account in any relocation of port facilities to Marino Point. As this is not specified, it is taken as including existing residential amenity,</p>	<p>That the proposed text additions to Objective TM 5-2 Cork and Other Ports will not lead to any significant effects on the Cork Harbour SPA which cannot be avoided or mitigated against.</p>	<p>Consideration was given to the conservation objectives and in-combination effects of Cork Harbour in previous related documents ie. Habitats Directive Assessment dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2014 and Addendum to Strategic Environmental Assessment Environment Report dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2014 for the Proposed Amendments to the Draft Cork County Development Plan 2013 AND Volume Three: Environment and Natura Impact Report, Section 2 Natura Impact Report of Draft County Development Plan 2013 dated the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that any effects arising out of this proposed amendment have been adequately addressed in the reports listed above. The final SEA and HDA Statements</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>tourism and recreation. No reason to expect significant effects by way of displacement of such amenities elsewhere adjacent to Cork Harbour SPA.</p> <p>Recommended that the comments outlined above be taken into account in the screening for AA and SEA.</p>		<p>accompanying the adopted plan will confirm this.</p>	
<p>Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources PAdCDP14/1966</p>	<p>This submission includes comments from Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI) providing information on the GSI Public Data Viewer and Geological Heritage Data, Datasets availability, online mapping and map layers and information on future data updates. Submission also provides guidance on the identification of Geological Heritage Sites with buffer and requests information collecting during any EIA for the GSI Karst dataset and a copy of reports detailing site investigation works carries out for the GSI national database of site</p>	<p>Information update from Geological Survey of Ireland.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	investigation boreholes.			
Department of Defence PAdCDP14/1952	This submission from the Department of Defence states that the Department of Defence no longer owns this Barracks. It is now owned by Cork County / IDA and Inland Fisheries Ireland.	This submission from the Department of Defence states that the Department of Defence no longer owns the Fermoy Aerodrome/Fitzgerald Barracks. It is now owned by Cork County / IDA and Inland Fisheries Ireland.	Noted.	1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage” “Record of Protected Structures”
EirGrid PAdCDP14/1964	<p>1. Eirgrid suggests additional text, policy and objectives to ensure that the ongoing development of transmission infrastructure in the county will occur in the context of good planning practice and the proper planning and strategic development of the county.</p> <p>2. Eirgrid by reference to its strategic obligations must ensure that a proposal is the most appropriate technology option, requiring a balance of cost, environmental and technical issues.</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment 9.11 be modified to insert additional text to consider the feasibility ‘and merit’ of undergrounding</p> <p>2. Should the proposed amendment be modified to incorporate the provisions of Article 6 by inserting the following text to Objective ED 6-2 and Objective ED 6-1 ‘except where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI)’?</p>	1 and 2. It is considered that objective ED 6-1 Electricity Network and ED 6-2 Transmission Networks (including Proposed Change no. 9.11) provides appropriate support for future development of the networks while protecting ecologically sensitive areas from adverse impacts.	1 and 2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>For this reason, a minor amendment is suggested to Proposed Amendment. 9.11 i.e. insert need to consider the feasibility ‘and merit’ of undergrounding.</p> <p>3. Eirgrid notes the final paragraph of Objective ED6-2 in relation to Appropriate Assessment and is concerned and questions whether this reflects both Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive. The development of national strategic infrastructure may be considered to be an imperative reasons of overriding public interest, as provided for under Article 6(4). Section 3.5 of ‘AA of plans and Projects of Ireland’ states that the competent authority must complete Stage 4. Suggests the following minor amendment to incorporate, in a practical way, the provisions of Article 6; insert ‘except where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI)’. This is also equally applicable to Draft Objective ED 6-1.</p>			



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Electricity Supply Board PAdCDP14/1963</p>	<p>1. ESB supports the planning policies and objectives as set out in Chapter 9 in relation to Transmission Networks, protection of the County’s future capacity for the development of energy generating, processing and transmission infrastructure while encouraging the sustainable development of the County’s renewable energy resources.</p> <p>2. ESB strongly welcomes the inclusion of clear polices promoting the use of Electric Vehicles and EV infrastructure set out in Appendix C Table 1a – Parking &amp; Cycling Standard and ESB strongly welcomes the targets and development management standards set out in the Plan.</p> <p>3. A minor text amendment is proposed to include a specific statement in relation to the provision of ‘on-street’ EV charge points to ensure the proposed levels of parking provision for EV’s are achieved i.e. by giving</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to include a specific statement in relation to the provision of ‘on-street’ EV charge points to ensure the proposed levels of parking provision for EV’s are achieved.</p>	<p>1.It is considered that Para 9.5.3 ‘Renewable Energy in Transport’ and Note 9 in Appendix C Table 1a provide adequate support to encourage electric vehicles and help meet Government Targets.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>consideration to the addition of a minor text amendment to the note No. 9 attached to Table 1a “the Council is committed to supporting EV technology and would be open to piloting charging points on-street at key areas subject to the availability of resources.”</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Environmental Protection Agency PAdCDP14/1998</p>	<p>Highlights a number of specific port and harbour masterplans that have been prepared for existing ports and have been assessed in accordance with the SEA and Habitats Directives. These include Dublin Port Company Masterplan, Shannon – Foynes Port Company Masterplan, Rosslare Harbour and Kilrane Local Area Plan.</p> <p>Recommends that consideration be given to the inclusion of a commitment in <i>Objective TM 5-2 – Cork and Other Ports</i>, for the preparation of Master Plans for the Port of Cork, including Ringaskiddy and Marino Point, and other key ports and harbours in the county ( e.g Castletownbere).</p> <p>It suggests that these should be prepared in collaboration with the relevant authorities and key stakeholders and should be subject to the requirements of the SEA and</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment be modified to include a commitment in <i>Objective TM 5-2 – Cork and Other Ports</i>, for the preparation Master Plans for the Port of Cork, including Ringaskiddy and Marino Point, and other key ports and harbours in the county ( e.g Castletownbere) ?</p>	<p>Noted. The amendments to Objective TM 5-2 have been subject to SEA Screening. The inclusion of additional text requiring the preparation of additional masterplans is outside the scope of the Development Plan Review process at this stage and is a matter for consideration at the next local area plan review.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	Habitats Directives.			
Fitzgerald Liam & O'Driscoll Paul PAdCDP14/1958	<p>1. Consideration of a Motorway Service Area at Junction 15 lands identified in dCDP 14/1837 submission should be revisited given the proposal is similar to one at J15 refused by ABP which is also within the town greenbelt.</p> <p>2. States that to explicitly support a new proposal at Junction 14 in close proximity to the NRA site at</p>	Should the proposed amendment be rejected and the Council instead carry out a comprehensive review relating to the provision of Motorway Service Areas on the M8?	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas"	See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas"

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>Kilworth is unreasonable and unsustainable.</p> <p>3. States that the Council have three choices, (a) Can adopt the policy (Change 10.8) as is with all its inequities, (b) Reject the proposed change (as it is not consistent with the detail of the adopted NRA Policy), the Spatial Planning and National Roads (Jan 2012) guidance which supports consideration of other facilities or (c) Amend the proposed change and make a minor change that supports consideration of Junction 15 and consideration of other facilities.</p> <p>4. Submission states that the best option given the "Tesco" Judicial Review at Charleville is for the Council not to adopt Change 10.8 and instead carry out a comprehensive review of the matter, with a view to a specific variation of the County Development Plan that recognises the capacity of other sites and facilities in Fermoy and Mitchelstown to meet the needs of the Spatial Planning and National</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>Roads (Jan 2012) guidance. States that it is clear that the NRA is committed to an online facility in Kilworth and the Council Policy jeopardises this.</p>			
<p>Friends of the North Cork Environment PAdCDP14/1989</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Coherent strategy for wind energy strategy required in the area.</li> <li>2. Figure 9-3: Revised Wind Energy Strategy Map should be revised to include all of the 'Important Landscape (medium)' designation outlined in Figure 9-2 Policy Considerations for Wind Energy Projects and should be outlined as 'Normally discouraged' for wind farm development due to the potential negative impacts on the landscape, visual amenity and the Greenbelt 1-1 designation.</li> <li>3. Wind energy infrastructure should not be considered as 'Open to Consideration' in this area due to its designation as an Important Landscape (medium). This area should not be considered for any further wind farm development due to the number of wind farm applications already granted and</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to remove the contradiction between the areas identified in Figure 9-2 Policy Considerations for Wind Energy Projects (Important Landscape (High)) and Figure 9-3 Wind Energy Strategy Map in north and north east Cork?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It was considered that some of the area in North Cork identified as Important Landscape ( High), given its particular landscape characteristics, was suitable for inclusion in the ' Open to Consideration' area on the Wind Energy Strategy Map.</li> </ol> <p>A number of key policy considerations were identified and taken into account in the development of the wind energy strategy map and associated objectives which identified three categories of wind deployment areas. This area is Open to Consideration in the Draft Plan and objective ED 3-5 provides adequate protection to the visual quality</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</li> </ol>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>also the areas designation as a Greenbelt 1-1.</p> <p>4. 50% of Cork County ‘Open to Consideration’ for wind farm development is an excessive amount and should be scaled back to reflect the serious environmental constraints;</p> <p>5. Revise Core strategy housing projections as core strategy considered inconsistent with the legislation and has not accorded with the RPGs or the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010. Distorts the amount of land required for development causing over-zoning and oversupply.</p>	<p>2. Should the proposed amendment be modified to exclude large scale wind energy developments from Town Green Belt area?</p> <p>3. Should the proposed amendment be modified to revise the Core strategy housing projections as core strategy considered inconsistent with the legislation and has not accorded with the RPGs or the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010. Distorts the</p>	<p>of this landscape.</p> <p>Within “Open to Consideration” areas there are a number of restrictions as set out in Objective ED 3-5 and Para 9.3.14 which mean that not all lands within these areas are considered suitable for consideration.</p> <p>2. Within the “Acceptable in Principle” and “Open to Consideration ” areas The Town Green Belts are not generally considered suitable for wind farm developments</p> <p>3. The South and East Regional Assembly (formerly South West Regional Authority) have confirmed that the population and housing growth targets set out in the Core Strategy of the Draft County Development</p>	<p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>3. See Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
		amount of land required for development causing over-zoning and oversupply?	Plan, 2013, are as far as practical, consistent with the South West Regional Planning Guidelines. See also Volume 1, Section 1(b). "Core Strategy""Housing Supply"	
Gottstein, Michael and Edwina PAdCDP14/1960	Coolkellure House (RPS 1465) should not be included in the record of protected structure for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property in question is not as mentioned a Victorian House. The original Coolkellure House was completely destroyed by fire in 1920. The current house is a house which replaced the original house and was built in the late 1920's.</li> <li>• The current Coolkellure House does not as described in the NIAH Survey consist of a detached ashlar limestone country house, built c.1865, having attached tower. Therefore the description of the house in the survey does not match the existing house and does not</li> </ul>	1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to not include Coolkellure House (RPS 1465) on the Record of Protected Structures?	1. It is considered that the exterior of the house is of significant merit to warrant inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures.	1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>meet the categories of special interest being; Architectural, Artistic, Historical and Social.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property has between 2004 and 2006 being totally renovated as it was in a near derelict condition. The renovations have in effect modernised the house to such an extent that all period features have been totally replaced with modern materials and finishes. These modern features are not of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest and therefore do not merit protection under the RPS. The extent of the renovations is outlined including photographic evidence.</li> </ul>			
<p>Hegarty John PAdCDP14/1942</p>	<p>The following concerns have been outlined in relation to Protected Structures in Innishannon;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been so much damage to the county stock of historic buildings and settings in recent years in particular Innishannon Village.</li> <li>• The study sponsored by "Leader"</li> </ul>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to include a proposal to combine the National Inventory of Architectural and Record of Monuments and Places so that all important structures are protected?</p>	<p>1. The Council are statutorily required under the Planning Acts to maintain a Record of Protected Structures. Objectives in the Draft Plan promote best practice in dealing with Architectural Heritage, see Section 12.4.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>and completed by local historical Society, The Friends of Innishannon on Innishannon could form part of the plan or considerations for the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting as a concept and detail was not always well protected in the County. Procedures need to exist to protect buildings that are more flexible.</li> <li>• The review of Protected Structures at every development plan helps but isn't enough. The National Inventory of Architectural Heritage has recorded many incredible historic buildings as has the Record of Monuments and Places yet many of these incredible and rare structures are not recorded as protected and have been damaged or lost completely in the past ten years. These lists should be combined and all automatically protected. Many recorded buildings were lost in Innishannon that were not protected structures. Three attachments attached of Riordans house Innishannon and what it</li> </ul>		<p>Cork County Council will continue to work with other interested stakeholders subject to adequate resources available to address Ministerial recommendations and make changes or amendments as per national legislation.</p>	

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>became is shown in drawings and photographs.</p>			
<p>Hegarty John PAdCDP14/1943</p>	<p>1. States that the schoolhouse in Baltimore Village County Cork is not a protected structure but is listed as an archaeological monument. The question is asked whether if it makes sense that Government lists buildings as monuments and many are also recorded in photographic surveys but they are then not recognised as Protected Structures? 2. Maintains that all archaeological monuments could easily be listed as Protected Structures. Suggests that they could be listed as an internal policy before all the procedures were carried out to complete the inclusion as protected structures. This should be an aim of the council in the development plan. This schoolhouse is of national importance and isn't protected. It needs to be added to the list now and not in five years time. Attached images and location of schoolhouse in Baltimore Village County Cork.</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to add the schoolhouse in Baltimore Village to the Record of Protected Structures?  2. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that all archaeological monuments are listed as Protected Structures in the development plan?</p>	<p>1. This structure does not form part of the proposed amendments and therefore cannot be considered for inclusion at this time. Cork County Council will continue to work with other interested stakeholders subject to adequate resources available to address Ministerial recommendations and make changes or amendments as per national legislation.  2. The principal mechanism for the protection of the archaeological sites and monuments is through the provision of the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP) which was established under</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.  2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
			<p>Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act, 1994. The RMP for County Cork was issued in 1998 and lists some 17,000 Monuments. Cork County Council will continue to work with other interested stakeholders subject to adequate resources available to address Ministerial recommendations and make changes or amendments as per national legislation.</p>	
<p>Hodder, Michael PAdCDP14/1992</p>	<p>1. Concerned about the Protected Structure status of Templebrady National School (RPS Ref 01390) including former Teacher's House and requests re consideration of the decision. 2. The school was built in the middle of the 19th Century and the requirements were extensive in order to modernize and provide schooling for 60 children and employment for 4 teachers, secretary, cleaner etc.</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to remove Templebrady National School (RPS 01390) from the Record of Protected Structures?</p>	<p>1. Templebrady National School is on the current RPS and the proposed amendments was promoted to clarify what buildings on the site were on the RPS i.e. the original school building only and not the other ancillary buildings on the site.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>3. Concerned that the burden of protected structure status of the school will result in closure of the School and the demise of the buildings.</p>			
<p>Horgan James PAdCDP14/1978</p>	<p>Submission from landowners within the X-01 Masterplan site requests that the Council brings forward the timeframe for the Ballyvolane Master Plan and the associated Local Area Plan amendment so that the Master Plan and associated LAP amendment is completed in 2015.</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment be modified to bring forward the timeframe for the Ballyvolane Masterplan and the associated Local Area Plan amendment?</p>	<p>The key infrastructure requirements for this area have been identified in revised Table 15.1. All the issues raised will be addressed in detail in the preparation of the Ballyvolane Framework Masterplan Study which will inform the next LAP review.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>
<p>Indaver Ireland PAdCDP14/1965</p>	<p>1. Welcomes the recognition of the significant bioenergy potential in the region citing the proposal to develop a waste to energy plant in Ringaskiddy. 2. Supports the key revisions made to Industrial zoning (ZU 3-7), coastal erosion and plans for Bottlehill (WS 7-1) with the exception of the text specifying the type of infrastructure within the scope for the Bottlehill facility. 3. States that the Southern Regional Waste Management Plan</p>	<p>Should the Proposed Amendment 11.13 be modified to remove the reference to the type of infrastructure use considered within the scope of the Bottlehill facility?</p>	<p>The text in Proposed Amendment 11.13 does not preclude a range of waste management infrastructure being considered on the site.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>will address the need for additional capacity and the suitability of sites for this capacity and it may not be appropriate in the CDP to specify any one type of infrastructure that would be considered an appropriate use at Bottlehill.</p>			
<p>Inland Fisheries Ireland PAdCDP14/1951</p>	<p>1. Requests that RPS No. 1479 ‘Fermoy Aerodrome/Fitzgerald Barracks’ not be included as a protected structure. 2. Stated that IFI are proposing to redevelop the Fitzgerald Barracks site to provide a fisheries operational base for the Fermoy area and ensure the State's involvement in the location into the future. 3. In 2013 Inland Fisheries Ireland purchased part of the old Fitzgerald Barrack site on approx. 1.5 acres site off the Dublin road in Fermoy from the Department of Defence. The site in question was only a small portion of the Aerodrome / Fitzgerald Barracks as it included</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment to include the Fermoy Aerodrome/Fitzgerald Barracks’ (RPS No. 1479) on the Record of Protected Structures not be proceeded with?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage” “Record of Protected Structures”</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage” “Record of Protected Structures”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>three old buildings all in varying stages of disrepair.</p> <p>4. The majority of the Aerodrome and associated lands have previously been purchased by the IDA and are partially developed (ground works only) as “Fermoy Business and Technology Park”. (Figure 1 &amp; 2) and the Chapel was handed over to the local parish.</p> <p>5. It is IFI’s intention to remove all existing buildings from the site and to replace the development with a new Fisheries store, offices and boathouse fit for use by the staff in the local district for the future.</p>			
<p>Irish Water PAdCDP14/1941</p>	<p>1. Submission states that there are no plans in place for any further improvements to the wastewater works in Dunmanway. States that the conditions and emission limit values specified in the Discharge Licence will ensure no deterioration in the quality of receiving waters as a result of the discharge.</p> <p>2. States that recent population projections published by the CSO indicate that populations in the</p>	<p>1. There are no plans in place for any further improvements to the wastewater works in Dunmanway.</p> <p>2. Sets out approach to addressing future population targets in the Plan taking CSO population projections</p>	<p>1. Noted. See Volume 1(b) “Core Strategy” “Population Growth targets for Sensitive Water”</p> <p>2. Noted. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy” “Housing Supply”</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1(b) “Core Strategy” “Population Growth targets for Sensitive Water”</p> <p>2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Core Strategy”</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>regions are unlikely to reach the levels indicated in the majority of RPG's of 2010.</p> <p>3. States that it is likely the Regional, Spatial and Economic Strategies published in 2016 will be informed by more recently published census data.</p> <p>4. Irish Water's objective is to provide both drinking water and wastewater capacity to facilitate core/settlement strategies at a county level, in line with national and regional planning policies and objectives subject to the availability of funding and to achieve compliance with relevant discharge licensing consents. Provision of water services will be on an incremental basis in line with current population and planned growth.</p> <p>5. Irish water will work with the Council in the implementation of the Development Plan to ensure that investment in water services infrastructure is aligned to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>	<p>into account.</p> <p>3. Will provide both drinking water and wastewater capacity to facilitate core/settlement strategies at a county level, in line with national and regional planning policies and objectives subject to the availability of funding and to achieve compliance with relevant discharge licensing consents.</p> <p>4. Will work with the Council in the implementation of the Development Plan.</p>	<p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p>	<p>“Housing Supply”</p> <p>3. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>4. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
Irish Wind Energy Association (IWEA) PAdCDP14/1975	<p>1. Proposed changes/ amendments to the draft revised Wind Energy Strategy will severely restrict the development of wind energy in the County and will impact the delivery of Ireland’s renewable energy targets.</p> <p>2. The restrictions in relation to Natura 2000 sites will significantly restrict the potential for wind energy development in County Cork.</p> <p>3. States that inclusion of unjustified increased restrictions and buffers as outlined is re-</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that there should be no blanket prohibition of development in Natura 2000 sites?</p>	<p>1. The Plan does not propose a blanket prohibition on wind energy developments in Natura 2000 sites however it does indicate that within these areas the standards are set much higher given their environmental sensitivities and the fact that other alternative more suitable less environmentally sensitive sites are available.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>considered in consultation with key stakeholders with regard to their appropriateness for the Draft Plan.</p> <p>4. Inclusion of specific renewable energy policies and objectives in the new Plan will promote the further development of renewable energy which will enable CCC to: Develop a sustainable, wind energy industry employing construction and professional service providers and attracting significant capital investment up to 2020; Enhance the vibrancy of the county; Support rural development in a sustainable manner; Deliver significant community benefit including the hedging against high fossil fuel prices and the provision of land lease payments to local landowners annually; Contribute to the funding of the construction of an electrical grid infrastructure that would be the basis of the new renewable energy industry; and, Deliver significant commercial rates revenue to County Cork annually.</p>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
<p>Jeffers, Rev. Cliff PAdCDP14/1968</p>	<p>1. In the 1980’s St Edmunds Church was scheduled for closure by the Diocese, but was given an extended stay.                  2. Should consider the following when proposing to add the Church to the Record of Protected Structures:                  a) the effect and implications that might be put on a small dedicated community on the future use and needs of the church building which has been kept in good repair,                  b) Consider listing the church building only, as it is the only significant structure, and that the grounds not be included. Would like to be able to do improvements to the landscaping, pathways etc                  c) Would like to have the option /flexibility to be able to adapt the interior of the building to respond to the needs of the local community.                  d) Erect a suitable notice board by the gate and lighting down the driveway to the gate                  e) Concern that the building is not currently insured for re-</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendments be modified to omit St. Edmund Church, Dromdasdil (RPS No. 01467) from the Record of Protected Structures?                   2. Is there currently grant assistance for assisting with insurance? If this is not currently the case, would it be considered in the future?</p>	<p>1. This structure is considered to have special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific or technical interest.                   2. There is currently no grant assistance for insurance of buildings on the Record of Protected Structures and the future provision of such assistance would be a matter for central government.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.                   2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>construction in the case of extreme damage (e.g. Storm, etc), and if the building is listed, this will be a considerable extra cost.</p> <p>3. Is there currently grant assistance for assisting with insurance? If this is not currently the case, would it be considered in the future?</p>			
<p>JR Oronco Ltd PAdCDP14/1985</p>	<p>1. States that recent NRA policy on Service Areas is supportive of an off line service area at Fermoy, which could be provided either at Junction 13 or 14.</p> <p>2. States that Junction 14 is the only feasible option, given ABP previous decision and infrastructural constraints at Junction 13.</p> <p>3. Requests that reference to the Draft policy in Change 10.8 be removed and text be amended to reflect that junction 14 on the M8 is one of only two locations nationally where an off line facility is advocated by the NRA.</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to remove the reference to the 'Draft Policy on Service Areas'?</p> <p>2. Should the proposed amendment be modified to reflect that junction 14 on the M8 is one of only two locations nationally where an off line facility is advocated by the NRA?</p>	<p>1 &amp; 2 - See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas"</p>	<p>1 &amp; 2 - See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas"</p>
<p>Keep Ireland Open PAdCDP14/1949</p>	<p>1. Submission supports the following proposed amendments 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.3, 5.4, 6.9, 8.1, 8.2 and 8.4. 2.</p>	<p>1. Does the Plan contravene the 2010 Planning Act relating to the mapping and listing of rights of way?</p>	<p>1. The Plan sets out that the Council will, where requested, give consideration to the inclusion of rights of way in the</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>2. Expresses frustration that previous suggestions to the plan were rejected.</p> <p>3. States the Plan will contravene the 2010 Planning Act relating to the mapping and listing of rights of way, NSS, DoECLG Guidelines, Development Plan Guidelines and the Plans of adjoining counties.</p>		<p>CDP, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Act and therefore complies with the Planning Acts as amended.</p>	<p>Modification.</p>
<p>Keep Ireland Open PAdCDP14/1950</p>	<p>Duplicate of 14/1949</p>			
<p>Marten, Brian</p>	<p>1. Endorses the proposal to include the former Baltimore Fishery School site/building and slipway, Ref RPS 01468 in the Record of Protected Structures.</p> <p>2. States that these buildings are very well built structures of very attractive appearance, the site has a very important place in the history of Baltimore and in this respect the inclusion of the slipway in the register if very important.</p> <p>3. Building should be protected for use in a marine- related capacity or even as a maritime heritage centre.</p> <p>4. The preservation of the slipway is therefore very important.</p> <p>5. Noted that the old stone building</p>	<p>1. Endorses the proposal to include the former Baltimore Fishery School site/building and slipway, RPS 01468 in the Record of Protected Structures.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>that was in the engine shed is in fact listed in the NIAH, but this listing does not give it any statutory protection.</p>			
<p>Miller, Tony and Laubach, Kristin PAdCDP14/1954</p>	<p>1. Approves PC 4.1 ‘strengthen and sustain vibrant rural communities’ for its positive contribution to rural society and tourism industry. Tourists appreciate the unique ‘lived in’ feel of the Irish Landscape and rural communities should be protected from the proliferation of wind farms                      2. PC 4.2 Strengthen weaker rural areas. As for 4.1 above                      3. PC 3. 8.1. Protection of tourist assets. Support this aim and potential tourist assets which considered underutilised such as archaeological and historic monuments.                      4. PC 8.4 an excessive numbers of wind farms in any area will have a negative impact on tourist numbers.                      5. P C 9.1 Wind energy projects - Issues such as cumulative effects,</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that larger buffer zones are provided around Natura 2000 sites and that buffer zones are provided around Natural Heritage Areas?</p>	<p>1. Appropriate buffer zones have been provided around the Natura Sites and these are considered sufficient to protect these ecologically sensitive areas. In the “Open to Consideration” areas Natural Heritage Areas are not generally considered suitable for wind farm developments.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>proportionality of burden and visual impact should be stringently applied and quantified in line with the new Landscape Convention. Unbalanced to have only two small areas both in West Cork, designated as 'acceptable in principle' for wind development</p> <p>6. P C 9.4 Areas OFC for wind development is about half of the area of the county.</p> <p>7. Requests that larger buffer zones needed around SAC's and Natura 2000 sites and should also include NHA's.</p> <p>8. High design standards in terms of environmental protection measures are expected of the wind energy industry in the initial EIA's and Planning Applications and not left for clarification later and should apply to works associated with the grid connection i.e.no split planning applications.</p>			





Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>7. Welcomes proposed change 10.7. 8. Recommends textual change to Proposed Changes 10.8 and 10.9 to reflect NRA Service Area Policy 2014.</p> <p>9. Recommends that proposals for private development off-line services and service stations are considered in the context of DoECLG guidelines and states the requirement for a forward planning approach to the provision of off-line MSA.</p> <p>10. Notes proposed change 2.11 and supports proposed change 15.6 re Masterplans.</p> <p>11. Acknowledges and compliments the Council relating to the strong alignment of the Draft CDP with NRA policy.</p>	<p>3. Improvements relating to national roads identified at a local level should be done in consultation with and subject to NRA agreement.</p> <p>4. Proposals for private development off-line services and service stations should be considered in the context of DoECLG guidelines and a forward planning approach to the provision of off-line Motor Service Areas is recommended.</p> <p>5. Should the proposed amendments 10.8 and 10.9 be modified to reflect NRA Service Area Policy 2014?</p>	<p>4-5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas".</p>	<p>4-5. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Motorway Service Areas".</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
National Roads Authority PAdCDP10.1714/1996	No comments to make in regard to the proposed amendment TM 5-2 Cork and Other Ports.	Noted	Noted	Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.
National Transport Authority PAdCDP14/1984	<p>1. Proposed Change 2.3 - Fuller explanation of ref to 'net hectares' and 'net densities' are included with ref to the Guidelines on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas. Residential densities in Tables 2.1 and A.1 under Net Ha, Estimated Requirement and the Residential Densities in Appendix G, the NTA reiterates previous recommendations.</p> <p>2. Proposed Change 6.5 - Recommends changes to Obj EE 4-</p> <p>4. 3. Proposed Change 10.4 - States that the ability to deliver an improved level of public transport service within the Metropolitan Area over the plan period and</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment 2.3 relating to the Core Strategy be modified so that a more complete explanation of 'net hectares' and 'net densities' are included?</p> <p>2. Should the proposed amendment 6.5 relating to Industry be modified?</p> <p>3. Should the proposed amendment 10.5 relating to Bus Transport be modified?</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy".</p> <p>2. It is considered that the existing objective should apply to all industrial development and not just goods trip or employment intensive industry</p> <p>3. It is considered that the additional text proposed would improve the objective.</p>	<p>1. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) "Core Strategy".</p> <p>2. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>3. Adopt Proposed Amendment with Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>longer term is contingent on the Council's prioritisation of development within public transport corridor locations and the application of development densities, land uses, parking standards and local connectivity / permeability. Reiterates the importance of the Council's role in providing an efficient operating environment in which bus services can operate and contribute to achieving the CDP sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>4. Proposed Change 10.5 - agrees with obi TM 2-4 (a) &amp; (b) of improving services. Recommends changes to TM 2-4 (b).</p> <p>5. PC 10.13 - Expresses concern relating to Appendix C Table 1a (note 2 &amp; 4) that the manner in which maximum parking standards are applied needs to be directly related not only to existing public transport attributes but also to a coherent approach to development prioritisation, dev density and transport investment prioritisation.</p>	<p>4. Should the proposed amendment relating to Table 10.13 (Car Parking) be modified to ensure that the manner in which maximum parking standards are applied needs to be directly related not only to existing public transport attributes but also to a coherent approach to development prioritisation, development density and transport investment prioritisation?</p> <p>5. Should the proposed amendment 15.7 (Table 15.2) relating to Douglas be modified</p> <p>6. Should the proposed amendment 15.9 (Appendix X) relating to Transport be modified?</p>	<p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5-6. Consideration will be given to minor modifications where appropriate.</p>	<p>4. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p> <p>5-6. Adopt Proposed Amendment with Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>6. Proposed Changes 15.7 - Table 15.2 – recommends changes re: Douglas and Proposed Change 15.9 Appendix X.</p>			
<p>O'Donoghue Vicki PAdCDP14/1983</p>	<p>1.This submission entitled ' Wind farm development in the Boggeragh Mountains south of Millstreet' makes reference to chapter 9 – sections 9.3.9 and 9.3.14 and indicates that these sections are highly relevant to this area ,where there is already large-scale proposed and permitted wind farm development and the developers are currently applying for bigger turbines of 136m and possibly higher .</p> <p>2. It is considered that the prospect of further industrial scale wind farms imposed on rural communities with higher turbines, increased noise and flicker effect, is disproportionate. I hope the</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to restrict development of wind farms in Duhallow area of North Cork as existing and permitted large-scale wind farm developments and proposals for bigger turbines will increase the noise and shadow flicker effect.</p>	<p>1. The revision of Ministerial Guidelines is outside the scope of the Development Plan Review process. Any new guidance emerging from the current Department of Environment national targeted review of the Wind Farm Guidelines relating to noise including separation distances and shadow flicker will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>2. The appropriate size of turbines will depend on the characteristics of each individual site and is a consideration for Development Management on a case-by-case</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>Planning Dept. will take this on board when considering applications from developers and their global financial backers.</p>		<p>basis.</p>	
<p>O’Leary Janice PAdCDP14/1969</p>	<p>Requests that the proposed Blarney Architectural Conservation Area be extended to include all of the area that was originally proposed for inclusion in the submission made by Blarney Community Council Ltd.</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment be modified so that the proposed Blarney ACA boundary is extended to include the former hotel site?</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage”, “Architectural Conservation Areas”</p>	<p>See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage”, “Architectural Conservation Areas”</p>
<p>O’Leary Mary CHASE PAdCDP14/2000</p>	<p>Concerned that the value of the Ringaskiddy/Monkstown Bay area as a residential, recreational and tourist amenity has been ignored in the proposed amendment to Objective TM 5-2 and suggests the objective be rejected by CCC in the interest of proper planning and sustainable planning and the greater good.</p>	<p>Should the proposed amendment be modified so that the value of the Ringaskiddy/Monkstown Bay area as a residential, recreational and tourist amenity is included in the proposed amendment to Objective TM 5-2?</p>	<p>Objective TM 5-2 is also linked to Objective EE 6-2 and it is considered that the two objectives when read together provide adequate protection to all residential amenity, tourism, and recreational uses around the harbour.</p>	<p>Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive's Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>The following concerns are outlined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The omission of the recognition of the value of the amenities of the Ringaskiddy/Monkstown area would result in loss of amenities and is considered in conflict with the following objectives of the CDP that make reference to recreational and amenity facilities including Page 84 Section 5.5.1, Objective SC 5-4 and Objective SC 5-7.</li> <li>2. Consider it a conflict of interest that the Local Authority support a private company in their efforts to seek planning permission for a development, which has been found to be unsustainable by ABP.</li> <li>3. Concerned that CCC has decided that the PC 10.17 would not warrant a full SEA (including a SFRA) as is required by EU law.</li> <li>4. If the Port was to get planning</li> </ol>			

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>permission to relocate to the Ringaskiddy area it would have very serious environmental effects on that area.</p>			
<p>RES PAdCDP14/1986</p>	<p>1. States that the placement of Natura 2000 sites within areas “Open to Consideration” affords these sites rigorous protection under the applicable legislation which is applied on a case by case basis in accordance with best practice, taking into consideration the merits of the individual proposal and also assessing the proposal in combination with other proposals and spatial considerations which have the potential to impact on Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>2. Urge Cork County Council to undertake further consultation with key stakeholders with regard to the appropriateness of inclusion of all Natura 2000 sites within the “Normally discouraged” zonation and the appropriateness of the</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified so that Natura 2000 sites are placed in “Open to Consideration” areas and not “Normally Discouraged” areas?</p>	<p>1.The Draft Plan does not propose a blanket prohibition on wind energy developments in Natura 2000 sites however it does indicate that within these areas the standards are set much higher given their environmental sensitivities and the fact that other alternative more suitable less environmentally sensitive sites are available.</p>	<p>1. Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.</p>

Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
	<p>inclusion of additional buffers around the entirety of these sites in an Irish context based on current knowledge and best practice.                      3. Particularly keen to be kept informed as the owner of an operational site at Taurbeg, which is currently located within a Natura 2000 site.</p>			
<p>Twomey McSweeney, Sara                      PAdCDP14/</p>	<p>1. Indicates that this cottage (RPS Ref 01480) was originally a county council cottage when purchased by submitter in 1995.                      2. Permission was granted in part for windows upstairs, front porch and woodwork over front doors and windows which cost e3400and was paid by submitter as Department of Heritage and Arts failed to give a ruling that the house was exempt despite the fact that they dropped in a letter to the house pertaining to the architectural value of the house.</p>	<p>1. Should the proposed amendment be modified to give additional financial support to owner of RPS 01480 - Victorian Gable fronted dwelling proposed for inclusion on the Record of Protected Structures.                       2. Should the proposed amendments to include the building on the RPS be proceeded with?</p>	<p>1. Noted.                       2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage” “Record of Protected Structures”</p>	<p>1. Noted.                       2. See Volume 1, Section 1(b) “Architectural Heritage” “Record of Protected Structures”</p>



Name of Interested Party and Unique Reference Number	PPU Summary Submission	Principal Issues Raised	Chief Executive’s Response	Chief Executives Recommendation
Waterford City & County Council PAdCDP10.1714/1995	No comments to make in regard to the proposed amendment to TM 5-2 Cork and Other Ports.	Noted	Noted	Adopt Proposed Amendment without Modification.



