

DRAFT CORK CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2015 - 2021

Chief Executive's Report on Public submissions to Proposed Amendment - as per Section 12(8) of P&D Act

18th February 2015



Cork City Council
Comhairle Cathrach Chorcaí

Section I: Introduction

This report sets out the Chief Executive's response on issues raised in submissions received on the Amendment to the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021. It has been prepared for the consideration of Council Members under Section 12(8) of the Planning & Development Acts 2000-2014. The Report should be read in conjunction with the Amendment document dated 15th December 2014, the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021 and the Chief Executive's Reports of 5th September and 24th November 2014.

Following a public consultation period which ran from the 15th December 2014 to 21st January 2015, 24 written submissions on the proposed Amendment to the Draft City Development Plan were received.

The report is set out in **Five Sections** as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Chief Executive's response and recommendations on issues raised in the submissions received on the proposed amendments to Volumes 1-3 of the Plan.
3. Issues raised in relation to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Chief Executive's responses and recommendations on same.
4. Summary of issues raised by the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government
5. List of Submissions

Section 2 and 3 set out the Chief Executive's response and recommendation to the issues raised in the submissions, taking into account the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and any relevant policies or objectives of the Government or any Minister of the Government. It is laid out in Volume and Chapter sequence, reflecting the Draft Development Plan, and should be read in conjunction with the Draft Plan and the Amendments document. Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike through~~ type and new text for inclusion is shown in **bold** type.

Section 4 gives a brief summary of the issues raised in the submission made by the Minister for the Environment Community and Local Government and cross references them with responses in Section 2. Section 5 lists the persons and bodies who made submissions or observations and a gives a brief summary of each submission.

Next Steps

Council Members have a period of up to 6 weeks from the date of receipt of the Chief Executive's report to consider same, and shall by resolution, having considered the Amendments and the Chief Executive's report, make (adopt) the plan with or without the proposed amendment, except that where they decide to accept the amendment they may do so subject to any modifications to the amendment as they consider appropriate.

Please note that any modification to the Amendment should be minor in nature and '*shall not be made where it relates to an increase in the area of land zoned for any purpose or an addition or deletion from the record of protected structures.*' S.12 (9) (c) Planning and Development Acts 2000-2014.

The new Development Plan comes into effect 4 weeks from the day that it is made.

Section 2: Chief Executive’s responses and recommendations on issues raised in the submissions received
Volume 1 Written Statement

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Ame nd. No.	CE’s Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 2: Overall Strategy			
<p>2.1: Goal 2 Montenotte Residents Association welcomes this amendment which inserts reference to Cork’s Healthy City status.</p>	20	2.1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Recommendation. No change.</p>
<p>2.2 Table 2.3 Indicative Capacity of Key Development Areas and rest of city for Residential Development</p> <p>The DECLG is concerned with the reduction in the total residential yield shown in Table 2.3 and notes that it is marginally below the housing requirement in the South West Regional Planning Guidelines target of 20,032 units up to 2022. In particular they are concerned with the proposed reduction in Mahon from 1650 to 1100 as this would not achieve an appropriate balance between residential and employment uses in the Mahon area, and is not in accordance with the Department’s Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities and Smarter Travel 2009-2020, The NTA also expresses concern at the reduction in residential units as the aim should be to consolidate development in the city and environs.</p> <p>The Southern Regional Authority (SRA) comments on the reduction in residential units in Table 2.3 in the context of proposed Mapped Amendment 16 in relation to Mahon Industrial Estate (see M16, below). They request that</p>	2 (NRA) 4 (DECLG) 14 (NTA) 19 (SRA)	2.2	<p>The concern at the reduction in the total residential yield is noted. The proposed amendment to Table 2.3: Indicative Capacity of Key Development Areas and rest of city for Residential Development are mainly consequent to the proposed zoning changes for Mahon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use Jacob’s Island; • Proposed Amendment M15: Mahon Point Shopping Centre; and • Proposed Amendment M16: Mahon Industrial Estate. <p>Whilst it is an objective of the Executive to increase the residential capacity of Mahon to assist in the achievement of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, changes to the residential unit figures in Table 2.3 could only occur as a consequence of zoning changes in Mahon.</p> <p>With reference to the NRAs submission, the proposed non-residential uses on Jacob’s Island are not supported in principle for the reasons set out in <i>Chief Executive’s Report on issues arising from submissions on the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021</i> (5 September 2014). I refer members to this report and the arguments put forward in it regarding the Mahon area. However Members did not support the views of the Chief Executive and amendments to the zoning of Jacobs Island were therefore not included in the Proposed Amendments. They cannot therefore be considered by the</p>

2.2 Table 2.3 Indicative Capacity of Key Development Areas and rest of city for Residential Development (continued...)

clarification is required in relation to the basis for the revised residential target for Mahon. Some internal calculation errors in the table are pointed out by SRA and DECLG.

The NRA states that its opinion remains that the justification for non-residential uses on Jacob’s Island has not been established and / or justified. They state that it is considered appropriate that a demand management strategy is developed at this stage to manage the impact of further traffic growth on the N40 in response to the likely impact of further congestion, reduced reliability and potential erosion of the level of service of the N40.

City Council for inclusion in the development plan at this stage in the process.

Recommendation

If Mapped Amendment M15: Mahon Point Shopping Centre or Mapped Amendment M16 Mahon Industrial Estate are not adopted then Table 2.3 will be amended accordingly as a consequent correction.

Make corrections to amendments to Table 2.3 to read:

Table 2.3 Indicative Capacity of Key Development Areas and rest of city for Residential Development

Area	Zoned land for development (ha)	Residential zoned land (ha)	Estimated capacity (housing units)	Residential and Other Use Zoning (ha)	Estimated Capacity (housing units)	Total Units
City Centre	8.9	4.5	474	4.4	429	903
Docklands	81.1	5.7	839	75.4	7388	8227
Mahon	29 20.17	29 13.08	1650 916	0 7.09	0 184	1650 1100
Blackpool	30.3	23.3	1013	7.0	287	1300
North West Regeneration Area	18.1	18.1	206	0	0	206
Rest of City	75.4 74.3	67.6 66.5	3030 2975	7.8	139	3169 3114
Total identified zoned sites	242.8 232.87	148.2 131.18	7212 6423	94.6	8427	15455 14850
Tivoli LAP area and zoned windfall sites	60					3,000 5,000
Windfall sites						2,000
Total residential yield						20455 19850

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 2: Overall Strategy			
<p>Residential Land Management Strategy</p> <p>The DECLG broadly welcomes the proposed objective 2.1 Residential land management strategy. However they note that it does not refer to mapping of the relevant lands, identification of alternative lands if key parcels did not progress, and establishment of a tracking mechanism as to progress of extant permissions.</p> <p>The NTA request an addition to Objective 2.1 to refer to public transport services and transport investment priorities such as those funded under the current NTA funding programme.</p>	<p>4 (DECLG)</p> <p>14 (NTA)</p>	<p>2.2</p>	<p>A system is being set up which includes mapping of lands and tracking of permissions. A minor modification to the objective can be made to make this explicit. An addition as suggested by the NTA is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation: Further modify proposed Objective 2.1 to read:</p> <p>Objective 2.1 Residential land management strategy An active residential land management strategy, (to include mapping the relevant lands, identification of alternative lands if appropriate, tracking of progress on planning permissions and identification of barriers to development), will be developed to promote residential and other construction on lands identified for development, identifying barriers to development and developing appropriate responses, taking into account the actions in Construction 2020, the Governments strategy for the construction sector, public transport services and transport investment priorities.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 2: Overall Strategy			
<p>2.3: Mahon Employment It is submitted by the Southern Regional Assembly that Objective ZO20 (Mixed Use Jacob's Island) and Section 14.6 of the Draft Plan, which refer to development in the Mahon area are inconsistent with Objective 13.1(d) of the Draft Plan that supports the city centre as being the leading primary office location and Objective 13.3 which states that the City Centre is the priority area for development in the city. SRA recommends that the City Council revise the Draft Plan to address these discrepancies to ensure the viability of the city centre as an employment centre is not compromised.</p>	19 (SRA)	n/a	<p>The Chief Executive's view on these issues has been set out in previous reports. However, the objectives referred to do not form part of the Proposed Amendments and cannot therefore be considered by Cork City Council at this stage in the development plan process, apart from in relation to Table 2.3 (see above).</p> <p>Recommendation: Not applicable.</p>
<p>2.3 Tivoli Docks The NRA requests consultation as a stakeholder during the local area plan process.</p> <p>The NTA states it will work with the local authority and other stakeholders in the preparation of Local Area Plans/ Masterplans for Tivoli (and the North and South Docks)</p>	2 (NRA) 14 (NTA)	2.4	<p>The NRA is a statutory consultee in relation to local area plans, as defined by Part 3 / 15 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2012. The City Council is therefore required to consult with the NRA on local area plans.</p> <p>The support of the NTA is noted.</p> <p>Recommendation No change.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 2: Overall Strategy			
<p>2.4 Core Strategy Diagram</p> <p>The NRA notes that the public transport route corridors are being removed from the development strategy diagram and recommend that it be made clear in the development strategy that it is intended to develop sustainable transport on the linking the city centre to key development areas.</p>	14	2.5	<p>The improvement of sustainable transport services along strategic transport corridors is addressed in Chapter 5 under <i>Objective 5.x Strategic Transport Corridors</i>, which refers to the studies which are being carried for each sector of the city. These studies will identify the key transport corridors for each sector and aim to optimise transport provision along these key corridors. It is also addressed under <i>Objective 5.x Land Use Strategies for Public Transport Corridors</i>.</p> <p>Recommendation No change</p>
CHAPTER 4: RETAIL STRATEGY			
<p>4.1 Old Youghal Road Local Centre</p> <p>The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to two issues raised at the Draft Plan stage relating to this Local Centre that were not addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of the designated area; • Appropriate uses for vacant buildings in the centre. 	20	n/a	<p>The zoning objective governs land uses in the centre. The area identified was excluded for good planning reasons due to the intermittent nature of the centre. This matter is not relevant to the Proposed Amendments and cannot be considered at this stage.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable.</p>
<p>4.2 Dillons Cross Local Centre</p> <p>The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to an issue raised at the Draft Plan stage relating to the revitalising of this local centre was not addressed.</p>	20	n/a	<p>This is a detailed matter not relevant to the development plan apart from at a policy objective level for ensuring all Local Centres are healthy. This matter is not relevant to the Proposed Amendments and cannot be considered at this stage.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 5: Transportation			
<p>5.1 Description of Modal Split in City The NTA recommends the following changes to descriptive text: make sentence about the benefits of an integrated transportation system more specific; add a phrase to note that Include that 6% are driven to work as passengers; clarify the sentence about the modal share of those both living and working in the city.</p>	14	5.2	<p>These revisions relate to explanatory text only but have no impact on objectives or policy.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify phrasing to incorporate suggestions.</p>
<p>5.2 Strategic Objectives The NTA recommends rephrasing of strategic transport objectives related to integrated land-use and transport, connectivity, and parking as follows:</p> <p>a. To promote integrated and sustainable settlement and transport strategies based on the principle of proximity. Provide for the greater consolidation of development within the City Centre, Docklands, Key Development Areas and Strategic Corridors, facilitated through the integration of landuse and transport planning, investment and service provision.</p> <p>i. To provide new local roads streets, upgraded streets, and pathways where required to increase better connectivity and reduce severance at the local level to facilitate access to local services, including public transport services, schools, shops, etc. by walking and cycling and reduce the need for car use, both for local and non-local trips.</p> <p>k. To control manage the supply and price of all parking in the city in order to achieve sustainable transportation policy objectives, while recognising the need to maintain economic vibrancy and acknowledging the current limitations of until more gaps in the existing alternative transportation systems are filled. bring parking policy and parking management into greater alignment with other land use and transport objectives and transport investment priorities.</p>	14	5.3	<p>Proposed revisions to Objective 5.1(a) provide specificity and therefore clarity.</p> <p>Proposed revisions to Objective 5.1(i) would limit the objective to improvements for walking and cycling, whereas this objective as written also includes the need for local streets (for car and other modes) to reduce over-reliance on the strategic roads network.</p> <p>Proposed revisions to Objective 5.1(k) would render the objective solely about transport, whereas the objective as currently written acknowledges the potential for potentially conflicting objectives in relation to economic development and reduction in car use. While both are achievable in tandem, doing so will require careful consideration during the implementation of the Development Plan and is therefore documented in Objective 5.1(k).</p> <p>Recommendation Revise objectives as follows: Revise Objective 5.1(a) as proposed; no change to Objective 5.1(i) and 5.1(k).</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 5: Transportation			
<p>5.3 Transport Assessment The NTA recommends clarification to descriptive text about landuse and transport integration and revision of Objective 5.x Transport Assessment as follows: “Planning applications for substantial developmentsshall include a Transport Assessment; the assessment shall demonstrate how sustainable transport patterns can be achieved by the development. the facilitation and encouragement of sustainable methods of transport.” The NRA advises in relation to plans for the Blackpool District Centre that, given the scale of development proposed, a transport assessment of the road network should be undertaken.</p>	14, 2	5.4	<p>Proposed revisions from the NTA to descriptive text have no impact on objectives or policy but bring clarity. Revisions to the Transport Assessment Objective clarify the objective with regard to national guidelines.</p> <p>The NRA’s observation in relation to Blackpool are noted but do not relate to specific amendments to the Development Plan and therefore cannot be considered at this stage. However, as established by the objective, Transport Assessment will be required as part of any major development proposal.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify descriptive text to incorporate the NTA’s suggestions; revise Objective 5.x Transport Assessment as proposed.</p>
<p>5.4 Work Place and School Travel Planning The NTA recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying the description of the NTA’s role in Travel Plans. • mentioning the NTA Guidelines <i>Workplace Travel Plans</i> and <i>Toolkit for School Travel</i>. 	14	5.5	<p>Revisions to explanatory text have no impact on objectives or policy but bring clarity to the Development Plan in relation to national policy.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify descriptive text as proposed.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 5: Transportation			
<p>5.5 Area-Based Strategies/ Strategic Transport Corridor Objective The NTA recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • changes to descriptive text to that clarifies how landuse planning and relates to transport investment. • Revision to Objective 5.x Strategic Transport Corridors as follows: Cork City Council will has commissioned studies to determine how to best optimise transport provision along strategic corridors within the city and will prioritise implementation of measures with the greatest potential to maximise modal shift with regard to public transport, walking and cycling, and in doing so, maximising return on investment. Upon completion, landuse and transport plans for each corridor will be revised and updated accordingly prepared, as set out in Objective 5.x below. • Revision to Objective 5.x Strategic Transport Corridors as follows: To develop landuse strategies that encourage higher-density uses provide for the consolidation of development at higher densities along key public transport corridors where feasible. 	14	5.7	<p>These revisions provide clarity to the policies set out.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify descriptive text and revised objectives as proposed.</p>
<p>5.6 Walking and Cycling Clarify descriptive text in relation to terminology, impacts of topology on walking, and correct typo in relation to National Cycle Policy.</p>	14	5.8	<p>The proposed revisions to descriptive text have no impact on objectives or policy but bring clarity to the Development Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation Revise as recommended.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 5: Transportation			
<p>5.7 Public Transport Revise Objective 5.x Support Bus Network Improvement to include the following additional action: Provide properly designed and located bus turning facilities to facilitate the delivery of a legible and reliable network of bus services.”</p>	14	5.15	<p>Cork City Council considers that bus turning should occur within the existing network in Cork, as specific turning facilities can lead to adverse impacts relating to parking and other problems.</p> <p>Recommendation Add phrasing regarding facilitating the delivery of legible and reliable network of bus services but exclude specific mention of bus turning facilities.</p>
<p>5.8 Integration and Multi-Modality The NTA recommends including the improvement of bus access to rail stations, to facilitate bus/rail intermodality.</p>	14	5.16	<p>The proposed revisions to descriptive text have no impact on objectives or policy but bring clarity to the Development Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise as recommended.</p>
<p>5.9 Review Car Parking Standards The NTA recommends revising phrasing of Objective 5.x Review Parking Standards as follows: To review and revise car parking standards and their application by 2017 (in conjunction with Cork County Council) in support of sustainable transport a range of sustainable land use and transport objectives.</p>	14	5.20	<p>Recommendation: Revise as recommended.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 5: Transportation			
<p>5.10 City Centre Parking The NTA recommends 1) modifying the following revision to descriptive text: The provision of alternative transport options will be increased considered to reduce the in combination with the reduction in the demand for parking. and 2) revising Objective 5.x Parking at Suburban District Centres as follows: To explore the potential for the introduction of parking management measures, including the potential for charges at suburban district centres in conjunction with the National Transport Authority in support of sustainable travel improved accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling and to reduce traffic car-based congestion. In doing so, the Council will consult with a range of stakeholders, including the National Transport Authority.</p>	14		<p>The proposed changes provide clarity. The original reference to the NTA can be deleted as proposed by the NTA, without the need to add a new sentence about working with stakeholders. Working with stakeholders is addressed globally at the beginning of the chapter.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise as recommended, excluding specific reference to NTA and stakeholders.</p>
<p>5.11 Park and Ride Revise descriptive text to quote Action 14 of the NTA's Smarter Travel Plan instead of just referring to it in the text.</p>	14		<p>The proposed revisions to descriptive text have no impact on objectives or policy but bring clarity to the Development Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise as recommended.</p>
<p>5.12 Terminology The NTA and NRA recommend clarification of terminology: Use "rail services" instead of "rail", "transport stakeholders" instead of "transportation stakeholders," walking and cycling as "modes" of transport rather than "forms", and definition of the strategic roads network.</p>	2, 14	<p>5.1, 5.1(o), 5.8, 5.14</p>	<p>These changes bring clarity to the text but no change in policy or objectives.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revised phrases as recommended.</p>
<p>5.13 Mayfield East Community Association The submission seeks upgrading of the North Ring Road, reduced speeds at Mayfield Village, improved public lighting in certain areas, and suggests the planned new North Ring Road should include links to industrial estates.</p>	1	n/a	<p>This submission does not relate to an amendment.</p> <p>Completion of the North Ring Road is included in Objective 5.6(c). The planning, construction, and maintenance of the Northern Ring Road are the remit of the National Roads Authority.</p> <p>Section 5.20 sets out that improvements to pedestrian facilities and the pedestrian environment will be considered based on findings of the Draft Cork City Walking Strategy and strategic corridor studies</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 6: Residential			
<p>6.1. Mayfield East Community Association made a wide ranging submission and pointed out the deterioration of the area in relation to a number of deprivation indices. It referred to increased unemployment rates, high numbers of lone parents and high levels of vacancy in the housing stock and suggests that similar action is needed for areas of the North East Ward as was proposed by the North West Regeneration Plan.</p> <p>Further issues raised in this submission are outlined below under 5.13 above 6.2 and 7.1 below.</p>	1	n/a	<p>This is a wide ranging submission raising many important points relating to the North East area. However none of the points raised relate to the proposed amendments to the Draft Plan and some of the issues raised are not appropriate to the Development Plan. Issues raised will be passed on to the Housing, Environment and Transportation Directorate where appropriate.</p> <p>Para. 6.13 of the Draft Plan states that the initial phase of regeneration of the Northwest quarter has commenced. A similar approach to other areas, such as the North East Ward, would be dependent on additional funding becoming available.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable</p>
<p>6.2. Dereliction and vacancy in North-East Mayfield East Community Association Submission refers to vacancy rates of public housing stock and dereliction in housing estates and commercial buildings in the area. It suggests that sites could be developed in co-operation with Cork City Council. Infill single units for older people could be provided at the Old Boy's School site on Springfield Road.</p>	1	n/a	<p>The submission does not relate to the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Objective 6.1 <i>Residential Strategic Objectives</i> covers some of the points raised: it encourages: the provision of a variety of sites for housing to meet the various needs of different sections of the population; the regeneration and maintenance of existing housing; the use of derelict or underused land & buildings to assist in their regeneration. Objective 6.4 <i>Housing Provision</i> supports and facilitates the provision of housing through various sectors including private, voluntary and co-operative housing sectors. The Local Authority will continue to implement and operate a range of housing schemes and will continue to look at viable alternatives in the delivery of suitable accommodation for all. It will also use its powers under the Derelict Sites Act to combat dereliction.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable</p>
<p>6.3 The DECLG considers the inclusion of Amendment 6.1 (to Objective 6.6) to be acceptable.</p>	4	6.1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Recommendation No change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend . No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/ Proposed Modification
Chapter 7: Inclusive Neighbourhoods			
<p>7.1 The Mayfield East Community Association submission refers to the need to refurbish and extend the Kerrigan/Tyrell Youth Centre, the Mayfield Boxing Club & provide a small heritage centre at the Old Boy's School site on Springfield Road and upgrade playing pitches in Lotobeg.</p> <p>The submission also states that social enterprise should play a greater role in regeneration of disadvantaged communities and that there is a need to enhance community co-operation and combat marginalisation</p>	1	n/a	<p>This submission does not relate to the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Objective 7.1a Inclusive Neighbourhoods Strategic Objectives supports the provision of appropriate community facilities and services for all; supports the provision by voluntary & state agencies of a wide range of community facilities; & supports the dual use of community facilities.</p> <p>The role of social enterprise is largely outside the remit of the development plan.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable</p>
<p>7.2 The DECLG considers the inclusion of Amendment Ref. 7.1 to be acceptable subject to the proposed Neighbourhood Strategy being prepared over the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The Montenotte Park Residents Association endorse the proposed amendment.</p>	2 and 4	7.1	<p>It is the aim of the City Council to achieve the policies and objectives of the City Plan within the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Recommendation No change</p>
<p>7.3 Strategy for those with intellectual disability and/or autism</p> <p>The DECLG considers the inclusion of new text and Objective 7.12A to be a detailed matter that may be addressed outside the scope of the development plan. Recommend that Amendment Ref. 7.6 be omitted.</p>	4	7.6	<p>Developing a detailed Strategy for People with Intellectual Disability and/or Autism falls outside the expertise of the City Council and outside the remit a City Plan guiding development. However, the revisions in Amendment 6.1 "Objective 6.6 Meeting Housing Needs of Special Categories" allows for the consideration of the social housing needs of people with intellectual disability and/or autism. Objective 7.1 <i>Inclusive Neighbourhoods</i> also supports the provision of appropriate community facilities and services for all, young, the ageing population, able-bodied and people with disabilities which includes those with intellectual and/or autism.</p> <p>Recommendation Omit Amendment Ref. 7.6 as previously recommended.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/ Proposed Modification
Chapter 7: Inclusive Neighbourhoods			
<p>7.4 The submission states that the Muslim Community will generate a need for additional schools in the Cork City area and that provision should be made in the Plan for locations for additional schools.</p>	9	n/a	<p>This submission does not relate to any of the proposed amendments. Objective 7.8 Educational Facilities, in Chapter 7 <i>Inclusive Neighbourhoods</i>, aims to ensure school and college sites are made available in accordance with the requirements of the relevant education authorities.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable</p>
Chapter 8: Arts Cultural Heritage and Tourism			
<p>8.1 Maritime Cork Failte Ireland request that a small change be made to Objective 8.3 Maritime Harbour to make it clear that the users in this section include tourists as well as locals and to highlight the benefits of</p>	15	8.1	<p>It is considered reasonable to make the suggested small changes</p> <p>Recommendation Make small changes to 8.3 to include reference to local users and tourists.</p>
<p>8.2 Made in Cork Failte Ireland requests that Objective 8.8 Made in Cork be modified to include reference to the benefits of the various actions for the tourism market as well as the local market.</p> <p>A general statement is also made that further amendments to other chapters should reflect the importance of access to water and parks for both locals and tourists, however these amendments are not identified.</p> <p>Failte Ireland also state that they are engaged in discussions towards a strategy for destination branding and development for the development of the visitor economy in conjunction with Cork City and County Councils in 2015 and that the City Plan should also adopt this strategy document.</p>	15	8.2	<p>It is considered reasonable that Objective 8.8 be modified as requested.</p> <p>It is not clear what other amendments are referred to but any improvements to river access or parks and recreational areas will be for the benefit of all users, both local and tourist.</p> <p>The adoption of any future strategies into the Development Plan can be considered by Council at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Recommendation Modify the first line of Objective 8.8 Made in Cork to refer to both the local and tourism markets so that it reads: It is an objective of Cork City Council to carry out the following actions for the benefit of both the local and tourism markets:</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 8: Arts Cultural Heritage and Tourism			
8.3 Mayfield Library The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to an issue raised in their submission to the draft plan regarding the upgrading of Mayfield Library that was not addressed.	20	11.1	Noted. The programme for investment in the library service is not included in the development plan and is an operational issue. Recommendation No change.
Chapter 9: Built Heritage and Archaeology			
9.1 Northside ACAs The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to three issues raised in their submission to the draft plan regarding the protection of built heritage in the northside that were not addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of Wellington Road / Saint Luke's ACA to include Middle Glanmire Road / Lover's Walk; • Workers housing on the NIAH in the northside should be protected by ACA (e.g. Kelleher's Buildings, Dillon's Cross and Old Youghal Road; and • Military heritage should be protected. 	20	11.1	Noted. The protection of buildings on the NIAH is an ongoing process that will take many years to complete. The City Council has an ongoing programme that protects structures of significance as resources allow. Recommendation No change.
9.2 Streetscapes The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer issue raised in their submission to the draft plan regarding the upgrading of historic streets and a programme for undergrounding services.	20	11.1	Noted. This is not an operational / resource issue and not a development plan issue. Recommendation No change.

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/ Proposed Modification
Chapter 10: Landscape and Natural Heritage			
10.1 Views and Prospects The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to an issue raised in their submission to the draft plan regarding the protection of views from the Montenotte Ridge that was not addressed.	20	11.1	This matter was addressed in Item 10.2 of the Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2014. In the Views and Prospects Study of 2006 this area was assessed. There are no strategic views of significance worthy of protection from the public domain. However, there are many from the private domain which cannot be protected. Recommendation No change.
10.2 Trees, Urban Woodland and Flowers The Montenotte Park Residents Association refer to an issue raised in their submission to the draft plan that was not addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees on the Tank Field should be protected; • Tree-planting programme should be quantified in relation to Objective 10.10; and • Foster flower planting. 	20	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Preservation Orders have a separate statutory process to the development plan. • It is acknowledged that Objective 10.10 could be made more tangible through specific targets. This should be addressed through the Cork Neighbourhoods Strategy; • Supporting flower planting is an operational issue and not a development plan issue. These matters are not relevant to the Proposed Amendments and cannot be considered at this stage in the process. Recommendation No change
Chapter 11: Recreational Infrastructure			
11.1 Importance of Recreational Infrastructure The Montenotte Park Residents Association endorses the proposed amendment.	20	11.1	Noted. Recommendation No change
11.2 Recreational Infrastructure Strategic Objectives The Montenotte Park Residents Association endorses the proposed amendment.	20	11.2	Noted. Recommendation No change

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/ Proposed Modification
Chapter 11: Recreational Infrastructure			
11.3 Public Open Space / Objective 11.7 The Montenotte Park Residents Association endorses the proposed amendment.	20	11.3	Noted. Recommendation No change
11.4 Play Facilities (11.35b-11.37) The Montenotte Park Residents Association endorses the proposed amendment.	20	11.5	Noted. Recommendation No change
11.5 The Glen Park The Montenotte Park Residents Association submits that their issues submitted to the Draft Plan in relation to the Glen Park were not addressed..	20	n/a	This was addressed by 11.5 of the Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2015. Recommendation No change.
11.6 Shortage of POS in the North-East of the City The Montenotte Park Residents Association submits that their issues submitted to the Draft Plan in relation to the shortage of public open space in the NE of the city was not addressed.	20	n/a	This was addressed by 11.5 of the Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2015. Recommendation No change.
11.7 Tank Field The Montenotte Park Residents Association submits that their issues submitted to the Draft Plan in relation to the Tank Field were not addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayfield Heights strip should be zoned POS • A plan should be prepared for the Tank field to illustrate how the park will be upgraded. 	20		This was addressed by 11.6 of the Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2015. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strip indicated is too small to be zoned as public open space; • The preparation of a plan for the development of the site as a park is an operational issue and not relevant to the development plan. Recommendation No change.

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 12: Environmental Infrastructure			
<p>12.1 Water Supply Irish Water recommends the following amendments:</p> <p>In Section 12.23, update text to state that there are plans for two new interconnectors, instead of stating that the interconnectors are already in place.</p> <p>In Section 12.24 note that susceptibility to flooding is another reason that the Lee Road Treatment Plant needs upgrading. Rephrase to state that water supply capacity will not be a limiting factor (rather than “impose no constraints”) and state that there is adequate capacity through 2021 rather than 2071 (to reflect the fact that plans are still underway and that a new treatment plant has not been constructed as previously planned when the Development Plan process commenced.)</p>	11	12.1	<p>Irish Water has the responsibility for water infrastructure, and these changes reflect their updated plans for same. The proposed changes are not material in that they have no knock on effects in the Development Plan but provide clarity in respect of Irish Water’s plans.</p> <p>Recommendation Revise as proposed.</p>
<p>12.2 Electricity Generation and Provision Eirgrid recommends the following amendments to Section 12.25:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • refer to infrastructure as “transmission infrastructure” instead of “infrastructure” for clarity. • Specify “in the South West Region” and in Cork City • Correct typo to state that regional and national policy promotes the protection and development of the grid. 	18	12.3	<p>These minor changes are not material but provide clarity to Eirgrid’s plans.</p> <p>Recommendation Revise as proposed.</p>
<p>12.3 Cork Airport & Noise DAA welcomes the policies with regard to Cork Airport. Notes the contents of the Cork Noise Action Plan 2013-2018 and refers to Noise Contours provided in the Special LAP for Cork Airport 2010. Submits that it is appropriate that policies in relation to the protection / prevention of noise sensitive uses within noise zones be included in the CDP.</p>	3	12.7 / 12.8	<p>The content of the submission is noted. Objective 12.20 Joint Cork Noise Action Plan of the CDP already seeks “to implement the recommendations of the Cork Agglomeration Noise Action Plan 2013-2018 upon its adoption, in order to prevent and reduce environmental noise.”</p> <p>Recommendation No change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 13: City Centre and Docklands			
<p>13.1 Beamish and Crawford Site</p> <p>A submission on behalf of the Minister for the Environment Community and Local Government (DECLG) relating to the former Beamish and Crawford site states: 'It is unclear how the proposed amendments to Para. 13.52 (set out under amendment 13.6) are in compliance with the Retail Strategy'. It also raises concerns that the inclusion of the 15% comparison floorspace cap is inconsistent with Objective 13.22 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The Department states that it is of the view that Amendment 13.6 (which provides for comparison retail floorspace of up to 15% of floor area) and Mapped Objective M18 (which proposes a change of zoning of the Beamish and Crawford site Commercial Core Area to City Centre Retail Area) should be omitted.</p>	4	13.6 M18	<p>The DECLG submission is not specific on its concerns in relation to the retail strategy or its justification for omission of the proposed amendments.</p> <p>The Joint Retail Strategy supports the City Centre as the main location for higher order comparison goods within the Cork Metropolitan Area and states that it should be the prime focus for future development of high order comparison retail floorspace.</p> <p>The Joint Retail Strategy refers to Core Retail Areas in the City Centre and Town Centres and Section 5.1 states: <i>In accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines, the Joint Retail Study identifies Core Retail Areas for the first and second tier centres within the Metropolitan Area Retail Hierarchy. As far as possible, new development will be sited within these core retail areas and will be assessed in accordance with the criteria set out in the Retail Planning Guidelines and the relevant Development Plan or Local Area Plan policies.</i></p> <p>The Core Retail Area (as defined in Appendix 2 of the background Retail Study) takes in the main existing shopping streets, and Grand Parade but does not include the Beamish and Crawford site. This took account of the absence of existing retail uses on the site and the alternative sites on Grand Parade closer to the main shopping area. The zoning in the Draft Plan reflected this thinking, in the exclusion of the Beamish and Crawford site from the City Centre Core Retail zoning. The recommendation in the Chief Executive's Report of 5th September 2014 was for the retention of the Draft Plan zoning.</p>

<p>13.1 Beamish and Crawford Site (continued...)</p> <p>A second submission on behalf of Heineken Ireland requests that the cap on comparison floorspace be increased to 17.5% of total; floorspace as 15% would not cover the amount of retail space permitted under the current permission. They are concerned that a request to extend the life of the permission would not be capable of being granted unless substantial works have been completed at the time of the request</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>Members decided to put forward a proposed amendment to revert the site to the City Centre Retail Core zoning on the basis that this would ensure that the existing permission could be extended without difficulty. The limit on comparison space would however act to ensure that future proposals could not consist purely of comparison retail uses.</p> <p>Objective 13.22 supports the development of a new mixed use quarter centred on the development sites at Beamish and Crawford, Grand parade and Sullivan’s Quay and proposes to examine the potential for this area to become a creative, civic, entertainment and residential quarter within the city centre. Objective 13.22 is not intended to be a land use zoning objective setting out all permissible uses, rather it sets out a possible overall vision for this part of the city centre. The intention is not to exclude retail uses from this broad area, indeed part of it immediately adjoins the prime shopping street and would be the next logical extension to the shopping area. It is not considered that Objective 13.22 and the proposed amendments to Paragraph 13.52 are inconsistent.</p> <p>The current planning permission for the Beamish and Crawford site includes an Event Centre, Cinema, offices, residential uses and approximately 3,500sqm net of retail space. The type of retail development is not specified – so it could be a mixture of convenience and comparison floorspace. The amendment to 13.52 and map amendment M18 as proposed by the Elected Members, take account of the existing planning permission, while at the same time putting a cap on comparison retailing.</p> <p>In response to the points raised by Heineken it is noted that the proposed 15% restriction in the amendment applies only to comparison floorspace. The current Planning Permission on the site does not specify the type of retail floorspace that can be built. It would be desirable to have a mix of comparison floorspace and</p>
---	-----------	---

<p>13.1 Beamish and Crawford Site (continued...)</p>			<p>convenience floorspace, serving local and visitor needs. The 15% cap on comparison floorspace is therefore considered more than adequate to meet the needs of the site and the area.</p> <p>Recommendation In line with previous recommendation - retain Draft Plan zoning. If members decide not to support this recommendation and go ahead with the zoning amendment, no further change is recommended to the 15% limit on comparison retail floorspace in Amendment 13.6.</p>
---	--	--	--

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 13: City Centre and Docklands			
13.2: Tackling Vacancy and Dereliction The proposed amendment is supported.	4 (DECLG)	13.5	Noted. Recommendation No change
13.4 Free Parking Scheme It is submitted by the Montenotte Park RA that the free city centre car parking at off-peak times should be extended to be year-round.	20	n/a	This matter is not relevant to the development plan and is not relevant to the Proposed Amendments and cannot be considered at this stage. Recommendation Not applicable.
Chapter 14: Suburban Areas			
14.1 Blackpool / Kilbarry The NRA advises that a strategic transport and traffic assessment is required for the Blackpool area, to take into account the wider North Cork Metropolitan Area.	2 (NRA)	n/a	Noted. This observation does not relate to a proposed amendment and cannot therefore be considered at this stage. Any major development proposals will be subject to transport assessment taking account of the proposed and existing situation. Recommendation: Not applicable.

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 14: Suburban Areas			
<p>14.2 Mahon Area</p> <p>It is the view of the DECLG that Section 2.25 (Mahon) and Z020(Jacobs Island mixed use zone) (and related 14.6)would be inconsistent with the <i>Core Strategy</i> for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dilution effect of the viability of the City Centre in the prime employment node to be created; • The dispersal effect of the focussed development of Mahon as an interim location for employment in the south eastern quadrant of the City Council area; • The very significant infrastructure constraints affecting Jacob's Island that have been the subject of adverse decisions by ABP; • The complete unsuitability of Jacob's Island for such a significant level of employment development; • The sense that the local area plan is developer-led rather than founded on a strategic and plan-led approach. <p>Clarification provided by the DECLG (4a) clarifies that the Department do not object to 2.25 in total, but that part of the paragraph refers to Chapter 14, which includes paragraph 14.6 (Jacob's Island Offices), which they do object to. The DECLG therefore request that paragraph 2.25 is amended to qualify its reference to Chapter 14, so that it does not provide tacit support to paragraph 14.6 (Jacob's Island Offices).</p> <p>The Department notes that the <i>Proposed Amendments</i> include none of the amendments requested in its submission to the Draft Plan (dated 17 June 2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.25 ('Mahon' part of Core Strategy); 	<p>4 (DECLG)</p> <p>4a (DECLG)</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The amendments proposed by the Minister were not considered appropriate by Elected Members of Cork City Council and were not included in the Proposed Amendments. They cannot therefore be included in the adopted development plan at this stage in the process. The views of the Chief Executive in relation to the proposed provision of offices and other Mahon amendments are set out on pages 105-115 of the <i>Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2014</i>.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable.</p>

14.2 Mahon Area (Continued...)

- Related objectives under Sections 14.6 (“provision is also made for mixed use development at Jacob’s Island of up to 15,000sqm of business and technology space and residential uses”);
- Objective 16.8: Tall Building in South Mahon / mapped objective;
- Objective Z020: Mixed Use Jacobs Island; and
- Consequent changes to mapped objectives.

The DECLG states that the Minister reserves his position to consider the use of the powers of Ministerial Direction under the Planning and Development Acts to direct the Planning Authority accordingly.

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 14: Suburban Areas			
<p>14.6: RTE Site, Jacob's Island</p> <p>It is submitted that the most appropriate zoning for the RTE site is public infrastructure and utilities on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility is an infrastructure of national and regional significance; • The height, presence and visual impact of the mast and tower; and • Surrounding sites have been developed. 	16 (RTE)	n/a.	<p>Noted. This submission repeats points raised in Submission No.70 to the Draft CDP consultation stage that were dealt with on page 70 of the <i>Chief Executive's Report 5 September 2014</i>.</p> <p>As this submission does not relate to a proposed amendment it cannot be taken into account at this stage in the process.</p> <p>Recommendation Not applicable.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 14: Suburban Areas			
<p>14.7 Tivoli Local Area Plan Montenotte Park Residents Association welcome the proposal for a Local Area Plan for Tivoli industrial area. They request that an additional requirement be included in Objective 14.4 to investigate the feasibility of developing recreational facilities in Tivoli to serve the wider needs of the city for open space, parkland and river based activities, as well as recreational amenities for the proposed new residential uses, and suggest extension of the Millennium Park, further amenity areas along the river, access to the river for recreational purposes, parking for the general public, and development of a park at the eastern end of the industrial estate near the Glashaboy River, to provide a green gateway to the city.</p>	20	14.1	<p>Public open space in a redeveloped Tivoli, including parks and riverside walks, will be required to be accessible to the general public as well as local residents and workers, as is the case elsewhere in the city. Development Plan policies encourage generous public riverside amenity areas where feasible.</p> <p>It would be premature to be specific as to the location of public open space in advance of preparing the Local Area Plan; in any case the general public will have an opportunity to make submissions when the local area plan is being drawn up.</p> <p>However it is considered reasonable to further modify Objective 14.4 by clarifying that recreational amenities should include high quality parks and riverside walks (and if feasible water access) to serve local residents, workers and the wider community.</p> <p>Recommendation: Further modify Objective 14.4 b. To read:</p> <p>14.4 b To investigate the feasibility of developing the area as a new medium density waterside residential quarter incorporating in the region of 3,000 residential units, complemented by local services and recreational amenities, which should include high quality parks and riverside walks (and if feasible access for water based activities) to serve local residents, workers and the wider community.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Chapter 16: Development Management			
16.1 Electric Vehicle Parking The NRA notes and supports this amendment.	2 (NRA)	16.6	Noted. Recommendation No change
16.2 Advertising Hoardings The NRA “notes the Chief Executive’s recommendation with regard to advertising hoardings in Section 16.116 but is unable to located in the amendments text or identify as an omission via the members.” The NRA had requested reference to the N40 as part of standards in relation to advertising hoardings set out in Section 16.116 of the Draft Development Plan.	2		The N40 was not specifically included in the Chief Executive’s recommendation. However, Section 16.116 establishes that excessive outdoor advertising will be strictly controlled and specifically states advertising will not be permitted where it may cause a road hazard or have a visual impact and this would apply to the N40 so should address the issues concerned. Recommendation No change
16.3 Transport Assessments The NRA states support for Amendment 16.6 related to Transport Assessments.	2	16.6	Noted. Recommendation No change

Volume 2: Mapped Objectives

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Volume 2 MAPPED OBJECTIVES			
<p>MI: Tivoli Docks The DECLG states that the proposal to change the zoning of Tivoli Docks from General Industry and Residential, local services and institutions' to an objective indicating a local area plan will be prepared is generally acceptable. However it notes that the boundary also includes a narrow strip of land zoned 'public open space' which is not shown on the amended map and requests that this be addressed.</p>	4	MI	<p>The narrow strip of land in question is an existing small park to the west of the existing entrance to the industrial estate which is zoned public open space in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend local area plan boundary to include and illustrate existing park area zoned public open space.</p>
<p>M3: Cork Airport Public Safety Zone The DECLG consider the mapped objective to be acceptable. See 12.3 (above) relating to written objective.</p>	4 (DECLG)	M3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Recommendation No change.</p>
<p>MI0, I2: Sandbrook / Wilton Lawn The submission makes no reference to the area of land proposed to be rezoned for public open space use or the proposed amendment to the Area of High Landscape Value.</p> <p>The submission seeks the provision of an access to a site to the east via the public open space in return for an investment in the park to improve it.</p>	13 (MHW)	MI0 and MI2	<p>The proposed change was submitted at the draft plan stage and was rejected by the City Council. It is not possible to make the amendment requested as this would be a material change.</p> <p>Recommendation No change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen. d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Volume 2 MAPPED OBJECTIVES			
<p>MI I: South Douglas Road Local Centre Submission on behalf of Kevin O'Leary Motor Services Ltd welcomes the proposed change of zoning of part of site to Local Centre but requests that Local Centre zoning be extended to the full site. They argue that it is inappropriate to have two zonings on their site as it is a single commercial site. They state that other Local Centres include car showrooms within the zoned area but it has been omitted from the Local Centre zoning on their lands. They also argue that it should be zoned neighbourhood centre rather than a local centre.</p>	7	MI I	<p>It is considered reasonable to zone the central part of the site as a local centre, as proposed in Amendment MI I, reflecting the existing anchor convenience store and related local service use.</p> <p>There is provision in the Draft Plan and proposed amendments to allow for the provision of new or expanded local centres and neighbourhood centres where a case can be made based on population growth or where a gap in provision can be demonstrated, subject to protection of residential amenities. It is not considered appropriate based on the evidence available to upgrade or expand the zoning of this site at this time. In any case further expansion of zoning is not possible at this stage of the Development Plan process.</p> <p>Recommendation No Change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Volume 2 MAPPED OBJECTIVES			
<p>MI5: Mahon Point Shopping Centre It is submitted that the proposed change of use to Residential, Local Services and Institutions in the Proposed Amendments (from the Business and Technology zoning in the draft plan) should be omitted from the development plan on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will inhibit the ability to deliver the range of uses envisaged in the <i>Mahon Local Area Plan 2014</i>, including live ground floor uses and a hotel; • The proposed offices are already subject to phasing in the Local Area Plan – they are proposed for Tranche 2, and therefore the concern about adequate infrastructure is not relevant to the zoning objective in the development plan. • The proposed residential use would be incompatible with the development form indicated in the Local Area Plan 	8 (OCD)	M15	<p>The proposed amendment was not considered appropriate by the executive at the previous stage of the plan process (see Chief Executive's Report of 24 November 2014 Responding to motions on Agenda at Council Meeting of Monday 24th November).</p> <p>The most appropriate use for the site in the medium to long term is Business and Technology, with other uses are open for consideration as specified in the Mahon Local Area Plan 2014 such as local services and a hotel. The <i>Mahon Local Area Plan</i> specifies that the development of the site will be forthcoming only during Tranche 2 after significant changes in mode share have occurred, consequent to investment in green modes. The location of the site between existing high density offices and Mahon Point Shopping Centre fronting onto a busy road is unlikely to make it attractive as a purely residential site.</p> <p>Recommendation Omit proposed amendment from the development plan as previously recommended.</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
Volume 2 MAPPED OBJECTIVES			
<p>MI6: Mahon Industrial Estate Mahon Industrial Estate The DECLG (on behalf of the Minister) is of the view that the mapped objective should not be proceeded with. The re-zoning of this area to business and technology would militate against the realisation of the long-term aim to redevelop the Mahon Industrial Estate for residential use.</p> <p>The Regional Assembly (SRA) recommends that Proposed Amendment MI6 be omitted from the plan and supports the recommendations of Section 14.4 of the <i>Chief Executive's Report</i> (5 September 2014). Having considered section 14.3 of the Draft Plan, Objective MSA2 of the Mahon Local Area Plan 2014. Section 14.4 of the Chief Executive's Report and Objectives RES-06 and RTS-01 of the RPGs.</p> <p>O'Flynn Construction (OFC) fully supports the proposed rezoning of the Mahon Industrial Estate to Business and Technology Uses on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the most appropriate use for the estate and reinforces the long-standing objectives to provide for employment; • Mahon Industrial Estate is an integral part of the achievement of employment targets for Mahon; and • Residential uses are inappropriate for this part of the city and will never be delivered in the Mahon Industrial Estate. 	<p>4 (DECLG)</p> <p>6 (OFC)</p> <p>and</p> <p>19 (SRA)</p>	<p>M16</p>	<p>The proposed rezoning of the Mahon Industrial Estate is not supported in principle for the reasons set out in <i>Chief Executive's Report on issues arising from submissions on the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021</i> (5 September 2014) and the Chief Executive's supplementary report of 24 November 2014 (Item 16, pp10-11). I refer Members to the report (and the Mahon Local Area Plan and related documents) and the arguments put forward in it regarding land use in the Mahon area and the Mahon Industrial Estate.</p> <p>The Lough Mahon Technology Park provides more than enough capacity to provide for the employment target envisaged by the development plan for Mahon. The land at Mahon Industrial Estate is therefore not required for additional employment as it would result in a significant over-supply of employment-related land.</p> <p>The Mahon Industrial Estate presents an excellent environment that is suited to residential use as part of a wider Bessboro Neighbourhood, whereas the Lough Mahon Technology is not easily developed for residential uses for a wide range of reasons.</p> <p>The Mahon Industrial Estate in residential use provides the main opportunity for the development of a more balanced mix of uses in Mahon. If the Council incorporate the change in zoning to business and technology uses into the development plan then this will mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a significant oversupply of land for employment use / business and technology offices in Mahon that has limited prospect of being developed for that purpose; <p>The Mahon Industrial Estate will not be further developed (intensified) to any significant extent due to transport constraints.</p>

<p>MI 6: Mahon Industrial Estate Mahon Industrial Estate (Continued...)</p>			<p>Recommendation Omit proposed amendment MI 6: Mahon Industrial Estate.</p> <p>In the event that Elected Members do not support this recommendation then the following option may be considered an appropriate alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow Residential, Local Services and Institutions uses to be open for consideration in the industrial estate as well as business and technology in principle on the basis that this would allow development for either use, depending upon market demand in principle and subject to assessment.
---	--	--	---

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
MAPPED OBJECTIVES			
<p>M17: The Tank Field (North Eastern Suburbs) The Department of Education and Skills (DES) submits that the area referred to as the “Tank Field” should revert to the “schools” zoning as proposed in the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021 in line with the proposed use of the site & existing planning permission.</p> <p>The DECLG notes the proposed amendment and is of the view that the planning authority should have regard to the ministerial guidelines “<i>The Provision of Schools and the Planning System</i>” (DEHLG), which requires Planning Authorities to identify suitable sites for schools.</p>	12 (DES) 4 (DECLG)	M17	<p>This matter was previously considered at the Draft Plan Stage – see issue 11.6 of the <i>Chief Executive’s Report 5 September 2014</i> (p80) and Motion 15 in the <i>Chief Executive’s Report 24 November 2014</i> (p9).</p> <p>It is considered that given the planning permission as granted by An Bord Pleanála, the area should revert to “schools” zoning. Should the school be built and if there is ever a need to extend same, regularising the zoning in accordance with the Board’s decision would be reasonable and practical.</p> <p>National guidance requires Planning Authorities to make appropriate provision for schools to meet the needs of neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Recommendation Omit proposed amendment M17 and revert to the zoning set out in the Draft Plan.</p>
<p>M19: Brighton House, Blackrock Expresses support for <i>Mapped Amendment M19</i> to restore the ‘Residential’ zoning to the site of Brighton House. The submission states that the site is a long standing residential site and includes submission of an undated aerial photograph of the area. The submission acknowledges that the restoration of the perimeter quay walls will mitigate flooding of the site.</p>	24	M19	<p>This site was zoned ‘Landscape Protection Zoning in the Draft Plan due to concerns about flood risk. The Elected Members decided not to accept the Chief Executive’s recommendation to retain this zoning and put forward a proposed amendment to zone the land for residential purposes, based on the submission made that this was previously zoned residential and that flood risk issues had been addressed in the recent decision to permit a dwelling on the site.</p> <p>Recommendation As previously recommended retain the Landscape Preservation Zone as the site falls within a flood risk zone.</p>

<p>Former Ford Factory (Marina Commercial Park) Proposed Architectural Conservation Area (Continued...)</p> <p>A second submission by Councillor McCarthy states that he understood that the Conservation Officer made an agreement with the owner ‘to get these structures ‘protected’ and that ACA status was not discussed with the owner.</p>			<p>further meeting with the Conservation Officer) by the site owner about the scope of the ACA, it was reduced in the proposed Amendments to the Plan to take account of his concerns.</p> <p>The description and the wording of the statement of character for this proposed ACA has been carefully devised so that it is in line with the principles embodied in the approved TPI0/34546, including the intention to greatly increase the density of the site in line with the SDLAP. It is not intended to ‘retrospectively revise’ the scheme already approved for the site, nor is the ACA designation in conflict with key elements of the approved scheme.</p> <p>The view of the Executive is that the reduced ACA as proposed in the Amendment is appropriate to protect the Heritage of the site and to take account of the Ministerial recommendations. (The 2 buildings could also be protected by entry onto the RPS as previously proposed.)</p> <p>It is important to note that at this stage in the Development Plan process Members can either decide to approve the proposed amendment (i.e. the reduced ACA) or revert to the larger ACA as proposed in the draft Plan. It is not possible at this stage to remove the entire ACA designation from the Plan, as this would not constitute a minor modification.</p> <p>Recommendation No change.</p>
--	--	--	--

Section 3: Issues raised in relation to the Strategic Environmental Assessment

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
SEA			
<p>3.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment Table 3 Evaluation of the Proposed Objectives to the Draft CDP, that potential for significant adverse/ negative impacts on environmental receptors along with a number of uncertain impacts have been identified. Recommends that appropriate mitigation measures are provided to address these negative/ uncertain effects.</p> <p>Monitoring of the performance of the Plan should provide for assessment as to how these environmental receptors are affected over the lifetime of the Plan.</p> <p>Section 2 Environmental Report – Chapter 8 Monitoring should be completed.</p> <p>Submission outlines requirements in relation to SEA screening of future amendments and steps to be followed on adoption of the Amended Plan, including the SEA summary statement.</p>	5		<p>In relation to Table 7.3, Evaluation of the Proposed Objectives there are a number of typing errors in relation to Objective 5.1 (l) to encourage the use of innovative measures to reduce the requirement for car-parking; and (n) to facilitate operation (and expansion) of Cork Airport and Port of Cork, recognising their significant role in the economic vitality and quality of life of the region. The illustrated ‘interaction’ between the CDP Objectives and the Environmental Protection Objectives or Receptors (i.e. Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna; and Climate & Air) are stated as ‘adverse impacts’ in error.</p> <p>In relation to the Objective (l) the interaction on the receptor is ‘beneficial / positive.’ That is to say that the objective to reducing the requirement for car parking would have a beneficial impact on biodiversity, flora and fauna and on climate and air quality.</p> <p>In relation to Objective (n) the interaction with the receptors is ‘uncertain.’ Expansion of the Airport and Port will be subject to planning permission and the requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment/ Statement and Appropriate Assessment. Mitigation measures will be addressed at design / planning application stage.</p> <p>Table 8.1 Monitoring Programme (SEA Chapter 8) has been completed as requested in current and previous submission.</p> <p>Recommendation To correct Table 3 - Objective 5.1 (l) & (n) as outlined above. To omit the stated ‘adverse’ impacts and replace with ‘beneficial / positive’ impacts and ‘uncertain’ impacts</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification
SEA			
<p>3.2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Submission refers to previous comments and requests that they are referenced and amended in the updated plan. In reference to the section 1.2 Proposed Amendments to the SFRA; “there is no significant Pluvial Flooding within the City boundary.” The OPW recommends that this statement needs to be justified and would welcome the identification of pluvial flood risk identification maps.</p>	17		<p>Comments in relation to the previous submission are noted. Regarding the issue of pluvial flooding, the City Council is of the view (based on the LeeCFRAMS) that there is no significant pluvial flooding in the City, (i.e. of strategic consequence) but acknowledges that pluvial flooding episodes have occurred in a number of areas.</p>
<p>3.3 Flooding in north-east of city Submission refers to a July 2014 ‘rainfall event’ affecting the north-east of the city including the Middle Glanmire Road, St. Lukes and Dillons Cross. The drainage system was inadequate to deal with volume of water and dislodged manhole covers. Deficiencies in drainage infrastructure should be addressed in future planning decisions.</p>	20		<p>The Council recognises that there are deficiencies in infrastructure that may result in pluvial flood events. Under Objective 12.2 the Council makes a commitment to prepare a stormwater management plan for the city; and under Objective 12.3 planning applications are required to include proposals for managing stormwater.</p> <p>Recommendation Sites of recurring flooding episodes will be indicated on flood risk maps.</p>
<p>3.4 Geological Natural Heritage Areas Geological Survey of Ireland has no comment to make in relation to the proposed amendments. GSI does comment on Written Statement Volume I regarding Geological Heritage Sites (Geological Natural Heritage Areas) within the City and includes a table with the coordinates of two sites.</p>	21		<p>Comments of the GSI are noted.</p> <p>Recommendation No change to the proposed amendments. However, it is considered appropriate to map the Geological NHAs in Figure 3 and Figure 3.3 of the SEA/ Environmental Report.</p>

Section 4: Summary of issues raised on behalf of the Minister for ECLG: with cross reference to Chief Executive's responses and recommendations in Part 2 above.

The Minister for Environment, Communities and Local Government made a submission on 20th January 2015 that included observations and recommendations on a wide array of issues relating to the Draft Plan and the Proposed Amendments document. The issues raised and the cross reference to the Chief Executive's response and recommendation regarding each one are set out below. Some of the issues raised by the Minister refer to an earlier submission made on the Draft Development Plan, rather than to the Proposed Amendment. The submission expresses serious concerns with certain aspects of the Draft Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021 and Proposed Amendments with regard to compliance with Ministerial guidelines and national policy and in terms of the Plan being internally inconsistent (principally in relation to the Mahon area). The Minister reserves his position to consider the use of the powers of Ministerial direction under Section 31 of the Planning and Development Acts to direct the planning authority accordingly.

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification in Part 2 above
<p>Core Strategy The DECLG is concerned with the reduction in the total residential yield shown in Table 2.3. In particular - concerned with the proposed reduction in Mahon from 1650 to 1100 units as this would not achieve an appropriate balance between residential and employment uses in the Mahon area. DECLG also request calculation errors to be corrected.</p>	4	2.1	<p>See response at 2.2 above.</p> <p>Recommendation: Correct calculation errors in table 2.3</p>
<p>Transportation The department supports Amendment Ref 5.3 Supports Amendment Red 5.7 and its inclusion of consideration for all users in the design process. Notes Amendment Ref 5.7 and reiterates view that Objective 5.11, regarding the need for a cycling strategy should be implemented as soon as possible</p>	4	5.3/5.7	<p>The support for the transportation objectives is noted.</p> <p>A cycling strategy for Cork city and environs is already in preparation with support from the NTA.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification in Part 2 above
<p>Inclusive Neighbourhoods – specific housing needs 6.3: The DECLG considers the inclusion of Amendment 6.1 (to Objective 6.6), which deals with housing for those with intellectual disability and autism, to be acceptable.</p>	4	6.1	<p>See response at 6.3, above. Recommendation: No change</p>
<p>Strategy for those with certain disabilities The DECLG states that objective 7.12A which proposes a strategy for people with intellectual disability and autism, is a detailed matter which may be addressed outside the scope of the plan. Recommend that objective 7.12A be omitted.</p>	4	7.12A	<p>See response 7.3 above. Recommendation: Omit amendment ref. 7.6</p>
<p>Beamish and Crawford Site The DECLG submission states that it is unclear how amendment 13.52 is in compliance with the retail strategy. Concerns are also raised with the 15% comparison retail floorspace cap which the Minister believes may be inconsistent with objective 13.22 of the draft plan. The Minister states that submission 13.6 and Mapped Objective M18 (change of zoning from Commercial Core Area to City Centre Retail Area) should be omitted.</p>	4	13.6 M18	<p>See response at 13.1, above Recommendation: No change</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amen d. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification in Part 2 above
<p>Mahon Area The Department notes that the <i>Proposed Amendments</i> includes none of the amendments which it submitted to the draft plan.</p> <p>The DECLG states that the Minister reserves his position to consider the use of the powers of Ministerial Direction under the Planning and Development Acts to direct the Planning Authority accordingly.</p> <p>The DECLG objects to the part of section 2.25 which refers to chapter 14 including paragraph 14.6 (Offices on Jacob's Island). They request that the paragraph is amended to qualify its reference to Chapter 14 so it does not provide tacit support to paragraph 14.6 and also objects to ZO 20 (Jacobs Island mixed use zoning).</p> <p>The DECLG notes that the objective relating to Jacob's Island Tall building has not been omitted and that it should be as will not be served by mass transit.</p>	4	n/a	<p>See response at 14.2, above Recommendation: Not applicable as does not refer to proposed amendment</p> <p>See response at 14.4, above Recommendation: Not applicable as does not refer to proposed amendment.</p>
<p>North Mall Distillery The department is worried that the inclusion of a vehicular route through the site will result in a range of impacts. It requests that the location selected for the bridge be evidence-based and planned. It should include rationale for the necessity for the bridge.</p>	4	14.3	<p>See response at 14.5, above. Recommendation: Refine text</p>

Key Issue	Sub. No.	Amend. No.	CE's Response/Recommendation/Proposed Modification in Part 2 above
<p>Tivoli Docks The proposal to change the zoning of Tivoli Docks to an objective indicating a local area plan will be prepared is generally acceptable, provided the inclusion of a small area of public open space within the plan boundary is addressed .</p>	4	M1	See response at Vol.2 M1 above. Recommendation: Amend objective to show existing area of public open space as open space zoning (as in Draft Plan) within local area plan objective
<p>Cork Airport Public Safety Zone Considers mapped objective to be acceptable. See 12.3 in relation to comments on written objective.</p>	4	M3	Comments noted. Recommendation: No change
<p>Mahon Industrial Estate The DECLG objects to Mapped Amendment M16: Mahon Industrial Estate (change of zoning from Residential to Business and Technology) as it would militate against the realisation of the long-term goal to redevelop Mahon Industrial Estate for residential use.</p>	4	M16	See response at M16, above Recommendation: Omit proposed amendment M16: Mahon Industrial Estate In the event that elected members do not support this recommendation two other options are put forward at 14.4 below.
<p>Tank Field The DECLG states that the planning authority should have regard to the ministerial guidelines '<i>The Provision of Schools and the Planning System</i>' which require the planning authority to identify suitable sites for schools.</p>	4	M17	See response at M17, above. Recommendation: Omit proposed amendment M17 and revert to the zoning set out in the Draft Plan
<p>Flood Risk Management The department notes the amendments to Para. 12.48. Advises that the planning authority have regard to the views of the OPW with regard to flood management.</p>	4	12.8	Noted.

Section 5: List of those making submissions and brief summary

No.	Name	On behalf of	Summary
1	Eddie Carey	Mayfield East Community Association	Mayfield area absent from consideration; North East Ward warrants action similar to the North West Ward Regeneration Plan. Housing Crisis in terms of vacancy & dereliction. Refurbish and extend Kerrigan/Tyrell Youth Centre & Mayfield Boxing Club. Consider a small heritage centre & single units for older people at the 'Old Boy's School' site, Springfield Road. Social Enterprise to be considered as a social initiative. Public lighting, traffic lights, roads, footpaths and speeding cars an issue on North Ring Road through Mayfield Village. Consider running track & children's playground and also upgrade playing pitches (also mentions Cornfield open space which is outside the City administrative area).
2	Tara Spain	National Roads Authority	Requests minor changes to phrasing in Chapter 5 and inclusion of details regarding advertising signage along the N40 in Chapter 16; The NRA do not consider that a justification for offices on Jacob's Island has not been identified in relation the strategic road network. Tivoli Blackpool
3	Yvonne Dalton	Dublin Airport Authority	Welcomes the policies in relation to Cork Airport. Notes the contents of the Cork Noise Action Plan 2013-2018 and refers to Noise Contours provided in the Special LAP for Cork Airport 2010. Policies in relation to the protection / prevention of noise sensitive uses within noise zones should be included in the CDP.
4	Patrick O'Sullivan	DECLG	The Minister makes observations on the Core Strategy, Vacancy and Dereliction, Transportation, Inclusive Neighbourhoods, Mahon, Beamish and Crawford, Tivoli, Cork Airport Public Safety Zone, The Tank Field, Amendment 6.6 / 7.6 and North Mall Distillery Site.
5	David Galvin	EPA	Strategic Environmental Assessment. Recommends that appropriate 'mitigation measures' are provided to address the negative / uncertain effects identified in Table 3 Evaluation of the Proposed Objectives to the Draft City Development Plan. That Table 8.1 Monitoring Programme should be completed. Outlines requirements in relation to SEA screening of future amendments and steps to be followed on adoption of the Amended Plan, including the SEA summary statement.
6	Mc Cutcheon Halley Walsh	O'Flynn Construction	Supports the proposed rezoning of Mahon Industrial Estate to Business and Technology Uses (M16).
7	Coakley O'Neill Town Planning	Kevin O'Leary Group	Requests that the proposed mapped amendment be altered to extend the proposed Local Centre zoning to cover their entire site, rather than solely the central portion.
8	Cunnane Stratton Reynolds	O'Callaghan Properties	Seeks that the proposed change in land use zoning for the Mahon Point overflow car park be omitted from the Proposed Amendments.
9	Maxwell and Associates	Islamic Educational and Cultural Centre	Over the lifetime of the plan, the Muslim Community will generate a need for additional schools.
10	Cunnane Stratton Reynolds	Gerry Wycherley/Templeford Ltd	Invites the proposed ACA to be omitted from the development plan.
11	Suzanne Dempsey	Irish Water	Requests minor updates to Chapter 12 that reflect updates in Irish Water's plans for capital infrastructure serving Cork City.
12	George Carolan	Dept of Education & Skills	The area referred to as the "Tank Field" that was zoned 'Schools' in the Draft City Development Plan 2015-2021 reverts back to 'Sports Grounds' in the proposed amendments. Given the existing planning permission and use on this site, the site should be zoned as 'Schools'.
13	Mc Cutcheon Halley Walsh	O'Brien and O'Flynn	Seeks for provision to be made to enable access to landlocked site at Sandbrook.
14	Owen Shinkwin	National Transport	Suggests minor changes to phrasing in Chapter 5 relating to descriptive text and objectives. Raises / reiterates concerns about the appropriateness of locating office uses on Jacob's Island, City Centre, Core Strategy, Transport

		Authority	
15	Eoin Mc Donnell	Faite Ireland	Requests small changes to Chapter 8 to expand the references to tourists and the tourism market and also to reflect the importance of access to water and parks for tourists as well as local people elsewhere in the plan..
16	O'Connor Whelan Ltd	RTE	Requests that their site in Jacob's Island, Mahon should be rezoned to Public Infrastructure and Utilities from Landscape Preservation Zone.
17	Shirley Crosbie	OPW	In reference to Section 1.2 Proposed Amendments to the SFRA, recommends that the statement " <i>there is no significant Pluvial Flooding within the City boundary,</i> " should be justified and would welcome the identification of Pluvial Flood Risk Identification Maps.
18	Sinead O'Malley	Eirgrid	Requests minor changes to phrasing in Chapter 12 in respect of the national grid.
19	Southern Regional Assembly		Identifies an internal discrepancy within the development plan – the offices proposed for Jacob's Island would conflict with Objective 13.1(d) and Objective 13.3. These should be revised without disadvantaging the City Centre. Mahon Industrial Estate should not be rezoned to business and technology uses. It should be clarified as to whether this rezoning has an adverse on the population targets in Table 2.3.
20	Anne M. Nolan	Montenotte Park Residents Association	Welcomes reference to Healthy Cities in Goal 2, Raise concerns about shortage of public open space in the North East and in particular refer to the Tank Field, requests qualitative standards for open space; welcome the proposal to prepare a public open space strategy and other policies in relation to public open space and amenities; would like a local area plan to be prepared for the North-east; raises concerns re flood risk and drainage difficulties in parts of the north east; refer to issues which they raised in previous submission which they say have not been fully addressed; raises issues to do with ACAs, streetscape, local centres, trees and urban woodlands; supports LAP for Tivoli, which should include recreational facilities to serve the wider city as well as local residents.
21	Dept of Communications	Geological Survey of Ireland	Geological Survey of Ireland has no comment to make in relation to the proposed amendments, but comments on Written Statement Volume 1 regarding Geological Heritage Sites (Geological Natural Heritage Areas) within the City and includes the coordinates of two sites.
22	Cllr Kieran Mc Carthy		Concerned that the proposed protection of the former Ford Factory has not been discussed with the owner. Disagrees with the proposed office space for Jacob's Island.
23	Mc Cutcheon Halley Walsh	Heineken Ireland	Requests that the cap on comparison shopping on the Beamish and Crawford site in the proposed amendment to Paragraph 13.52 be changed from 15% to 17.5%.
24	Mc Cutcheon Halley Walsh	Sean Keohane	Supports Mapped Amendment M19 to restore the 'Residential' zoning to the site of Brighton House, Blackrock

18th February 2015



Cork City Council

Comhairle Cathrach Chorcaí