

**Chief Executive Report on Proposed Variation No. 3 (NPF Implementation)**

**Appendix 3: Summary of the issues raised in Submissions received (numerical order)**

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kieran McNally</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission contends that zoning additional lands for development in Kerry Pike will increase car dependency in the area as there are no active travel or sustainable transport options at present. Traffic congestion has got particularly bad at peak times and there is no real alternative for residents other than the private car. This will only get worse with increased construction traffic and more car dependant homes. To facilitate any zoning of additional lands for housing there should be an investment in the following: increase frequency of buses in proposed NTA Bus Connects Route timetable; construct a footpath along Upper Leemount (past Horgan's Garage), south along Prospect Hill and connecting to the Lee Road to allow for Active Travel; improve the junction of Prospect Hill and Upper Leemount by widening the junction or adding traffic lights, and consider making Prospect Hill one way north of the junction; improve and signalise the junction for traffic coming from Poulavone Roundabout to Leemount Cross (beyond Anglers Bar); invest in the primary school in Kerry Pike to facilitate increased population.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Graham Murphy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns regarding a proposed residential development at Glashaboy Heights, Glanmire, including traffic generation, road safety, construction impacts, and infrastructure capacity. It notes that access would be via a narrow residential road which may not be capable of accommodating increased traffic volumes. Potential impacts on residential amenity arising from construction noise, dust, and air quality are referenced, alongside concerns regarding construction management practices. The submission also highlights incomplete infrastructure within the existing estate, pressure on local services including healthcare, schools, childcare and public transport, and the cumulative impact of residential development in the wider area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John O’Dwyer</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly opposes the proposed housing development at Zoning Ref. NE 1 Sallybrook, Glanmire, on the grounds that it would result in overdevelopment of an already densely populated residential area and place further strain on infrastructure that is already under pressure. It highlights existing traffic congestion and road safety concerns, particularly at peak times, and notes that local services such as schools and healthcare facilities are operating at or beyond capacity. The submission also raises concerns regarding the impact of prolonged construction activity on nearby residents, including noise, dust, loss of residential amenity, and effects on health and quality of life, especially for families living directly adjacent to the site. Overall, it contends that the proposal fails to adequately consider the capacity of infrastructure and the well-being of existing residents and should not proceed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Colm Walsh</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (Zoning Ref. SW1 and SW2), for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing road network consists of narrow local roads that are already heavily congested and lack the capacity to safely accommodate additional traffic.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure and services, including roads, drainage, public transport, and community facilities, are already under pressure and have not been upgraded to support further development.</li> <li>• Rezoning the lands in advance of delivering the necessary supporting infrastructure is considered premature and unsustainable, particularly when considered cumulatively with other proposed rezonings nearby.</li> <li>• The lands at SW2 are located beneath an active airport flight path, giving rise to concerns regarding noise, residential amenity, and land use compatibility.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Andrea O'Regan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission relates to a proposed residential development adjacent to an existing housing estate at Glashaboy Heights, Glanmire, and raises concerns regarding traffic generation, road safety, residential amenity, environmental impacts, and the capacity of local infrastructure. It states that access would be via a narrow residential road which, in the view of the submission, is not designed to accommodate significantly increased traffic volumes and may pose safety risks. Concerns are also expressed regarding potential noise, dust, and air-quality impacts arising from construction activity, with reference to previous development works in the area. The submission notes unresolved infrastructure within the existing estate and indicates pressure on local services, including healthcare, schools, childcare, and public transport. In addition, the cumulative impact of multiple residential developments in the wider area is identified as a matter requiring consideration. The submission concludes that, in the absence of adequate mitigation and supporting infrastructure, the proposed development would give rise to adverse impacts on residential amenity, traffic safety, and service capacity.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Maritime Area Regulatory Authority (MARA)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The Maritime Area Regulatory Authority (MARA) welcomes the opportunity to consult on Proposed Variation No. 3. The submission sets out their role in relation to planning functions, references the National Marine Planning Framework (NMPPF) and its relationship with land-sea interactions, and refers to the Maritime Area Consent (MAC) and Marine Usage Licence (MUL) procedures. The submission notes that Cork City Council, as a Coastal Planning Authority, has a statutory obligation to ensure the development plan is materially consistent with the National Marine Planning Framework (NMPPF) in the preparation of both the variation</p>			

itself and the associated environmental assessments. MARA notes that none of the proposed zoning amendments are located directly within the maritime area, however, there may be indirect impacts on the maritime area which require consideration against the objectives and policies of the NMPF.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 4

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Moneygourney Residents Association</b>
-----------------------	----------	--------------	---

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas from City Hinterland (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2). The lands form part of the greenbelt at the edge of the city.

The submission contends that the proposed rezoning is premature and not sufficiently supported by existing or planned infrastructure. Concerns are raised regarding traffic congestion, road safety, drainage and flooding issues, and the capacity of the local road and drainage network, particularly in light of recent, permitted, and under construction developments in the wider area, including Foxwarren and Maryborough Ridge. It is stated that the cumulative impact of these developments has not yet been fully realised or assessed.

The submission asserts that the proposal conflicts with the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which promote compact, sustainable, plan led development and prioritise brownfield and infill development over additional greenfield zoning. It is argued that rezoning the lands would contribute to urban sprawl rather than consolidation of existing built-up areas.

Environmental and biodiversity concerns are also raised. The lands are described as performing an important role in supporting biodiversity, managing surface water runoff, maintaining visual amenity, and acting as a buffer between residential areas and major infrastructure, including the nearby motorway. The submission notes the loss of mature trees and natural screening along the motorway corridor and considers the retention of remaining greenbelt lands to be of increased importance.

Flooding is identified as an existing issue in the area, including flooding affecting Moneygourney Road and nearby properties. The absence of a clear and robust drainage strategy, combined with the cumulative effects of development, is cited as a concern regarding the suitability of the lands for residential development.

The submission further expresses concern that the rezoning would represent piecemeal, site led planning rather than being part of a coordinated, long-term strategy for the area.

As an alternative to residential rezoning, the submission supports the retention or rezoning of the lands for sports and recreational use, citing a lack of public green space in the area and the proximity of Douglas Hall Football Club, which is identified as a valued local amenity requiring additional space to remain viable at its current location.

The submission requests that the lands not be rezoned for residential use at this time, and that either the lands be rezoned for sports and recreational purposes or that consideration of their future use be deferred to the next local area planning process, anticipated around 2030, to allow for a more comprehensive and strategic assessment.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Maire Herlihy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission relates to the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas from City Hinterland (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2). The lands form part of the greenbelt at the edge of the city.</p> <p>The submission contends that the proposed rezoning is premature and not sufficiently supported by existing or planned infrastructure. Concerns are raised regarding traffic congestion, road safety, drainage and flooding issues, and the capacity of the local road and drainage network, particularly in light of recent, permitted, and under-construction developments in the wider area, including Foxwarren and Maryborough Ridge. It is stated that the cumulative impact of these developments has not yet been fully realised or assessed.</p> <p>The submission asserts that the proposal conflicts with the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which promote compact, sustainable, plan-led development and prioritise brownfield and infill development over additional greenfield zoning. It is argued that rezoning the lands would contribute to urban sprawl rather than consolidation of existing built-up areas.</p> <p>Environmental and biodiversity concerns are also raised. The lands are described as performing an important role in supporting biodiversity, managing surface water runoff, maintaining visual amenity, and acting as a buffer between residential areas and major infrastructure, including the nearby motorway. The submission notes the loss of mature trees and natural screening along the motorway corridor and considers the retention of remaining greenbelt lands to be of increased importance.</p> <p>Flooding is identified as an existing issue in the area, including flooding affecting Moneygourney Road and nearby properties. The absence of a clear and robust drainage strategy, combined with the cumulative effects of development, is cited as a concern regarding the suitability of the lands for residential development.</p> <p>The submission further expresses concern that the rezoning would represent piecemeal, site-led planning rather than being part of a coordinated, long-term strategy for the area.</p> <p>As an alternative to residential rezoning, the submission supports the retention or rezoning of the lands for sports and recreational use, citing a lack of public green space in the area and the proximity of Douglas Hall Football Club, which is identified as a valued local amenity requiring additional space to remain viable at its current location.</p> <p>The submission requests that the lands not be rezoned for residential use at this time, and that either the lands be rezoned for sports and recreational purposes or that consideration of their future use be deferred to the next local area planning process, anticipated around 2030, to allow for a more comprehensive and strategic assessment.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>The Moore Family (Withdrawn)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN – LOCATION NOT IN CORK CITY COUNCIL’S ADMINISTRATIVE AREA			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

Submission No.	10	From:	Cllr Oliver Moran
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission argues against removing certain Rural Housing Policy sections, stating that many of them are in-keeping with the proposed new policy, and that leaving them in place would continue to discourage one-off rural housing, while allowing the exceptional case.</p> <p>In some cases, the removal of text would provide an incentive to develop one-off rural housing, e.g. removing 11.133 could introduce an inducement to build in a hinterland area; and removing 11.135 may remove the first-instance priority of seeking to reuse abandoned hinterland properties, before building a new one.</p> <p>The submission proposes to keep the text in both Parts (c) and (d) of Objective 3.13 which discourages urban generated housing in the City Hinterland; and keeping Section 11.133 regarding limiting one-off dwelling size. The submission also proposes keeping the 2 sentences in Section 11.135 which give first priority in meeting housing need to re-using vacant/derelict rural built heritage assets.</p> <p>The submission objects to the proposed change in Section 11.131 which would expand the definition of a “nearby landholding” from 0.4 km to 1.5 km as it would greatly increase the potential development area without sufficient justification and grossly exceeds the aims of the policy change.</p> <p>Finally, the submission objects to the proposed change in Section 3.53 which would allow one-off housing within 1 km of urban areas as by definition it would effectively promote urban sprawl, harm future planning, and undermine protections for urban development. The submission notes that the proposed relaxation of rural spatial planning must not be at the expense of urban planning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 78			

Submission No.	11	From:	Conor O'Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed residential rezoning at Lehenaghmore on the basis that it is premature, not infrastructure-led, and contrary to national and local planning policy. It argues the site fails the NPF Tiered Approach, with no evidence of Tier 2 servicing, and that prioritising this greenfield land over urban brownfield sites constitutes leapfrog development. The submission identifies substantial technical risks, including reliance on COVID-era airport noise data that understates true exposure, failure to account for Cork Airport expansion, and serious downstream flood risk, as development of an 11.4-hectare permeable plateau would exceed the limited freeboard of the Togher flood defences. Existing traffic congestion, unresolved road capacity, and the perception of pre-determination through early access works undermine the plan-led process, while steep gradients and physical pinch points render proposed active-travel measures ineffective.</p> <p>It further highlights a severe shortfall in social and community infrastructure, inconsistent with the 15-Minute City model, warning that continued high-density housing without services will entrench Lehenaghmore as a car-dependent dormitory area. The submission notes unassessed ecological constraints, including protected bats, badgers, hedgerows, and stone walls, making rezoning procedurally flawed without a multi-season environmental assessment. It also identifies unacceptable landscape and visual impacts, as development would irreversibly harm the city’s southern ridgeline. The primary request is to retain the site’s</p>			

open space/hinterland designation; failing this, it seeks strict, binding site-specific objectives requiring infrastructure delivery first, robust controls on hydrology, transport, ecology, noise, landscape protection, and the phased provision of community facilities prior to any residential occupation.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Emer MacHale</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rezoning is at odds with the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 which prioritise (a) compact growth, and (b) a plan-led approach rather than piecemeal opportunistic development.
2. Zoning for residential use is premature given the documented constraints in local infrastructure: existing roads (specifically Maryborough Hill and Johnstown) are already congested and unsafe, with evidence of structural issues (road subsidence). There is also insufficient proof of adequate drainage and wastewater capacity to support additional large-scale residential density.
3. The site functions as a vital greenbelt buffer, facilitating natural water runoff and ecological connectivity, natural drainage, and acting as a visual and noise buffer between major motorway infrastructure and residential communities. Development would erode the dark sky conditions, and the rural character of the hinterland.
4. The area already has surface water management issues. Additional development would increase surface water runoff, worsening existing flooding issues without a comprehensive drainage strategy.
5. The land is important for recreation, with a chronic shortage of local green space, and development could negatively affect amenities such as Douglas Hall Football Club, stifling their ability to expand and potentially forcing their relocation.
6. The submission recommends that any rezoning should be deferred until the 2030 Local Area Planning cycle to allow for proper infrastructure capacity assessment, environmental evaluation, and community consultation.

The submission calls for retaining the current zoning (City Hinterland) to protect the greenbelt and support future community use, rather than allowing premature residential development.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ger Manley</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to, and requests the material amendment of, Policy 10.286A of the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which relates to the design of the movement network for proposed development in Riverstown. It raises concerns regarding the proposal to route traffic through existing estates. It submits that existing streets were not designed for this

purpose, that the increased traffic could pose safety risks to pedestrians and children, that noise from additional traffic will negatively impact residential amenity. It cites concerns regarding the construction phase, including early working, noise, and dust pollution with implications for health and amenity. These concerns arise from experiences with previous construction activity in the area. It further submits that the existing adjoining estate remains incomplete, e.g. road surfacing and signage. The submission states that no explanation or justification has been provided regarding the removal of the Landscape Preservation Zone. It submits that social infrastructure (schools, GPS, childcare facilities) is already lacking or at capacity in the area and submits that public transport services are poor. It expresses concerns about cumulative impacts and requests that comprehensive, independent assessment take place of all matters is carried out before consideration is given to granting planning permission.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	14	From:	Lisa Leahy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes the rezoning of City Hinterland lands (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2) at Moneygourney, Douglas, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal must be considered in the planning context of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, regional, national and EU policy provide the planning context.</li> <li>2. Prematurity due to infrastructure constraints: Zoning for residential use at this stage is premature and appears development-led rather than infrastructure-led. Concerns expressed regarding existing constraints in local infrastructure: roads (specifically Maryborough Hill, Johnstown Road and Moneygourney Road) are already congested, with evidence of structural issues (road subsidence). Further, there are ongoing drainage and flooding issues, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, and unknown cumulative impacts of multiple large-scale developments already under construction or permitted in the area.</li> <li>3. Conflict with compact growth: The Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 promote compact growth through prioritising development within existing built-up areas, focusing on brownfield and infill sites and avoiding unnecessary expansion into greenfield land. Submission outlines there is significant vacant and underutilised sites within the city centre and existing urban areas that should be prioritised for regeneration which benefit from existing infrastructure and services and would reduce the impacts of urban sprawl.</li> <li>4. Environmental impact on existing residents: The rezoning and future development would have a negative impact on existing residents, resulting in increased noise, light and air pollution and loss of natural screening and visual amenity, reducing quality of life. The submission outlines that safe walking routes are not available in the vicinity due to increased traffic and unsuitable infrastructure and proposes to rezone the lands for recreational use for the benefit of the wider Douglas and Rochestown community.</li> <li>5. Environmental and biodiversity importance: The lands are an environmental buffer and part of the greenbelt, providing clean air, drainage, and habitat for different species. Rezoning would result in permanent habitat loss and fragmentation, contrary to national biodiversity objectives.</li> <li>6. Drainage and flooding: The area already has surface water management issues. Additional development would increase surface water runoff, worsening existing flooding issues and pressure on an existing inadequate drainage system whilst providing</li> </ol>			

<p>a downstream flood risk. Submission notes the lack of a comprehensive drainage strategy or an assessment of the cumulative impact of multiple new developments.</p> <p>7. Piecemeal planning: The submission states that the proposal is not part of a coordinated long-term plan and would set a precedent for further greenbelt rezoning, creating a precedent that will lead to surrounding land being developed.</p> <p>8. Existing local pressures: The area is under strain due to traffic and serious road safety issues, inadequate infrastructure, flooding problems, lack of public green space. The impact of recent and planned development has not yet been realised.</p> <p>9. Community value: There is a shortage of local green space, and development could negatively affect amenities such as Douglas Hall Football Club, stifling their ability to expand and potentially forcing their relocation, which would add to traffic volumes.</p> <p>10. Future Planning Opportunity: The submission states that the lands ought to be considered as part of the next local area plan (c. 2030) allowing for proper assessment and coordinated planning.</p> <p>The submission concludes the proposal is premature, unsupported by infrastructure, contrary to planning history, environmentally damaging, likely to worsen existing issues and requests that the rezoning is not approved and the lands either rezoned for recreational use or the decision deferred to a future planning process.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b></p>
<p>See Response Ref. 18</p>

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kelly Kirwan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1, Glanmire, noting that it will impact them on a daily basis and into the future. They highlight concerns about: the environmental impact of developing the fields; construction dirt and daily noise; that they have had to put up with so much disruption with past developments in the area. They also stress that their children deserve the small piece of open land they have on their estate to play uninterrupted without trucks and unwanted extra traffic roaring through.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Billy Kirwan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Sallybrook (NE 1) from a Landscape Preservation Zone (ZO 17) to a New Residential Neighbourhood (ZO 2). The main points of objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic and Safety Concerns:</b> The resident is worried that Hazelwood Gardens could be used as an access route for a large new housing development, leading to increased traffic, safety risks for families and children, and disruption during construction (noise, dust, heavy vehicles) and beyond.</li> <li>• <b>Loss of Green Space:</b> There is concern that road widening or alterations to facilitate access could result in the loss of the estate's green area, which is valued by residents and contributes to their quality of life.</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental and Amenity Impact:</b> The current zoning protects the landscape and local environment. Rezoning would change the area's character and could lead to overdevelopment.</li> <li>• <b>Existing Traffic Issues:</b> The estate already faces difficulties with traffic, especially when exiting onto the main road. Additional development would worsen these problems. <b>Previous Refusal:</b> A similar rezoning proposal was previously refused during the Covid period for the same reasons, and the resident argues that circumstances have not changed.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>
See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Pamela Coughlan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission expresses concern at a prospective thoroughfare through Crestfield and Hazelwood estate from any new housing development in Glashaboy Woods, highlighting that extra traffic would prove a health and safety risk to all residents owing to the width of the roads, and would also be a risk to children who play football on the green and often have to run onto the road to collect the football.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Simon Tiptaft</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Zoning for residential use at this stage is premature and appears development-led rather than infrastructure-led. Concerns expressed regarding numerous existing constraints in local infrastructure: existing roads (specifically Maryborough Hill, Johnstown Road and Moneygourney Road) are already congested, with evidence of structural issues (road subsidence). There is also ongoing drainage and flooding issues, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, unknown cumulative impacts of multiple large-scale developments already under construction or permitted in the area, and present existing struggles to deliver housing on already zoned lands.</li> <li>2. The proposed rezoning is at odds with the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 which warns against piecemeal, site-led development and instead promotes growth through prioritising development within existing built-up areas, focusing on brownfield and infill sites and avoiding unnecessary expansion into greenfield land. Submission outlines there is significant vacant and underutilised sites within the city centre and existing urban areas that should be prioritised for regeneration which benefit from existing infrastructure and services and would reduce the impacts of urban sprawl.</li> <li>3. The area has already experienced significant change due to ongoing development and additional housing would increase air, noise and light pollution, traffic volumes and perceived safety for pedestrians, loss of natural screening and erosion of environmental character. The submission also outlines the land is a critical part of the city's greenbelt and is a buffer from surrounding infrastructure such as the motorway, The greenspace is</li> </ol>			

<p>a haven for biodiversity in the area which has already experienced a significant loss of mature trees and screening. Therefore, the remaining area of greenbelt is crucial in supporting ecological balance, biodiversity connectivity and visual amenity.</p> <p>4. The area already has surface water management issues. Additional development would increase surface water runoff, worsening existing flooding issues and pressure on an existing inadequate drainage system while providing a downstream flood risk. Submission also notes the lack of a comprehensive drainage strategy or an assessment of the cumulative impact of multiple new developments.</p> <p>5. The land is important for recreation, with a chronic shortage of local green space, and development could negatively affect amenities such as Douglas Hall Football Club, stifling their ability to expand and potentially forcing their relocation. Submission outlines a better use for the land would be rezoning it for sports and recreational use.</p> <p>The submission recommends rezoning be deferred until the 2030 Local Area Planning cycle to allow for proper infrastructure capacity assessment, environmental evaluation, and community consultation.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b></p>
<p>See Response Ref. 18</p>

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Foley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed road through the Crestfield and Hazelwood estates from the farmland in Glashaboy Woods that is proposed to be rezoned. Submission notes that the roads through Hazelwood and Crestfield are too narrow and not capable of dealing with the additional traffic that development would bring. In addition, children play on the two large greens on this route which would be a huge health and safety factor.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michelle Boland</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Glashaboy Heights. Resident concerned about the impact this development would have on the local environment, infrastructure, and the safety and wellbeing of the existing community. A primary concern relates to traffic congestion and road safety; the proposal to provide access through existing estates such as Hazelwood and Crestfield would exacerbate this issue and create serious safety risks for pedestrians, particularly children travelling to and from school. In addition, the proposed rezoning would result in the loss of valuable green space and natural habitat. This proposal represents a change to the existing development plan without adequate consideration for the environmental impact, particularly on local wildlife and natural habitats currently supported by this greenfield land. Furthermore, the scale and density of development being considered appears excessive for this location and is not supported by the current infrastructure. This risks placing undue pressure on local services and could significantly alter the character of the existing community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ian Field</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land for development in the vicinity of Crestfield/Hazelwood in Glanmire as it would increase traffic significantly through an already extremely busy access road to Hazelwood/Crestfield housing estates. Development cannot be at the cost of safety or significant traffic congestion for the existing residents of both Crestfield and Hazelwood estates.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Elizabeth Joyce</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land for development in the vicinity of Crestfield Downs/Glashaboy Heights as it would create a substantial volume of traffic onto Crestfield that the estate was not designed to accommodate. Submission notes that the area was not designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic and already experiences pressure during peak times. Submission also notes potential consequences, including congestion, reduced road safety and increased risks for pedestrians, especially children. They believe the development would fundamentally alter the character of the estate by turning a quiet residential road into a main access route, particularly as many residents would likely use it to reach nearby shops. The submission raises concerns about the broader impact on infrastructure, drainage, and wildlife, stating that these issues have not been adequately addressed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brian Conroy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (Zoning Ref. NE 1) from Landscape Preservation to New Residential Neighbourhoods. It argues that the site is effectively landlocked, so all access would have to come through existing estates with narrow roads unsuitable for increased traffic. The submission raises concerns about additional traffic creating road safety risks for children and worsening congestion on an already busy local road network. The proposal is said to conflict with the current Landscape Preservation zoning and to depend on significant infrastructure, including a new bridge, that is not yet provided. It is further stated that Glanmire already faces pressure on services, making further residential development unsustainable.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Laurie O'Dwyer</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of land in the vicinity of Crestfield/Hazelwood Estate, Glanmire. While they recognise the need for additional housing, they argue that the proposal would significantly worsen traffic on an already busy access road to the Hazelwood and Crestfield housing estates. The existing roads in Hazelwood and Crestfield are narrow and unsuitable for increased traffic. The objection also highlights safety concerns, particularly for children and families who regularly use nearby green areas, noting the risk posed by blind corners and narrow roads. The submission calls for an alternative access route that does not route additional traffic through these established residential estates, as residents would bear the negative impacts without benefiting from the development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ivica Skrlec</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Glashaboy Heights. Resident concerned about the impact this development would have on the local environment, infrastructure, and the safety and wellbeing of the existing community. Glashaboy Heights and the surrounding estates already experience significant congestion, and the local road network is not designed to accommodate a substantial increase in traffic. The proposed rezoning would also result in the loss of valuable green space and natural habitat, with consequent impacts on local wildlife and natural habitats.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Adrian Conlon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission seeks the rezoning of approximately 15 hectares of lands at Nash’s Boreen, Hollyhill, from Public Open Space (ZO 16) to Residential – New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 02), on the basis that the lands are suitably located, serviceable, and capable of contributing to compact growth, housing delivery and the rebalancing of development on the north side of Cork City, particularly in proximity to major employment and the proposed Northern Distributor Road.</p> <p>In this context, the submission contends that residential development would also provide passive surveillance and increased activity adjoining the proposed regional park, improving safety and usability of the amenity, however it is noted that this submission was originally made as part of the Cork City Development Plan consultation process in 2021, prior to the adoption of the current Development Plan and its associated zoning objectives.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 40			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rita Casey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to proposed rezoning of 270ha of land in Glanmire for residential use. Notes that the area couldn’t handle the increased traffic through Crestfield and Hazelwood, and that it would also be a hazard for the children playing on the green. Highlights that there are not enough amenities in Glanmire to handle more development, and people are already struggling to find childcare/schooling areas.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nuala O’Leary</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to proposed rezoning of land for development in the vicinity of Crestfield/ Hazelwood Estate, Glanmire. Highlights the following issues: that the road is not designed to accommodate a substantial increase in traffic volume; new development will increase noise levels and disturbance, thereby negatively impacting the residents’ quality of life; the proposal would significantly impact the limited amenity space currently available to local children; and there would be a deterioration in road safety. The submission calls for an alternative access route that does not route additional traffic through these established residential estates.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Marija Todorovic</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield/Hazelwood in Glanmire, citing several concerns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The local road network is under significant strain, with frequent congestion. The roads are narrow, not designed to handle increased traffic, and further development would likely worsen congestion, increase journey times, and raise safety risks for all road users.</li> <li>• The area already experiences high levels of noise and air pollution due to its proximity to a nearby highway. Additional development would increase traffic volumes, further degrading air quality and noise levels, with negative effects on residents’ wellbeing.</li> <li>• The removal of greenfield land, which currently supports biodiversity, would undermine the ecological value of the area and diminish an amenity enjoyed by residents.</li> <li>• The proposal conflicts with sustainable development principles as set out in planning policy, particularly as supporting infrastructure is already under pressure. Development should be directed where infrastructure is already in place.</li> </ul> It concludes that the rezoning is premature and inappropriate, and requests that Proposed Variation No. 3 be rejected and existing zoning protections retained.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tim Lynch</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire. Submission highlights the housing crisis, the issue of widespread dereliction, inconsistent planning processes that appear to favour developers, and questions where is the appetite for a multifaceted approach to solving the housing crisis. Expresses dissatisfaction that homeowners have bought their houses in the knowledge that the surrounding area was zoned as a Landscape Preservation Zone, and now that privilege is being taken away. Submission expresses concern about rezoning plans affecting their estate, particularly fears of long-term construction disruption and lack of consideration for existing residents. They also note that local infrastructure is beset by traffic congestion, public transport is inadequate, and primary infrastructure may not be improved.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Anju John</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, on several grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It highlights the significant loss of valuable greenfield landscape currently protected under ZO 17 zoning, emphasising its importance for biodiversity, natural habitats, and visual amenity for local residents.</li> <li>• It raises concerns about inadequate infrastructure, noting that the existing road network is already under considerable strain, and that schools, healthcare services, and other facilities are not equipped to accommodate further residential development.</li> <li>• It highlights issues with flooding in the area, warning that additional development could worsen this problem.</li> <li>• It argues that the proposed rezoning is premature in the absence of a comprehensive masterplan addressing necessary transport upgrades and community infrastructure.</li> <li>• It highlights the likely negative impact on existing communities of increased traffic, noise, and pressure on already stretched services.</li> <li>• Finally, the submission contends that the rezoning is inconsistent with sustainable planning principles, particularly the need to protect greenfield land and prioritise brownfield or infill development.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Carol Hartnett</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, on the basis that it conflicts with key policies of the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, particularly those relating to sustainable transport, infrastructure capacity, landscape protection, and sequential development.</p>			

It raises concerns that the development would exacerbate existing traffic congestion, particularly around the R639 and Dunkettle approaches, and increase reliance on private cars, contrary to policies in CCDP 2022-2028 (Objective 3.1 and 4.2) which promote sustainable transport, reduced car dependency, compact growth, and safe road networks.

The submission highlights the lack of adequate community infrastructure, noting that schools, healthcare services, childcare facilities, and recreational amenities in Glanmire are already under pressure and would not support additional housing without significant expansion, contrary to policies in CCDP 2022-2028 (Objective 6.1 and 6.5) which promote that this infrastructure is planned in tandem with housing.

It further emphasises the loss of protected landscape, stating that rezoning would remove an important green buffer, reduce biodiversity, and negatively impact the visual character of the area, in conflict with policies on green and blue infrastructure and landscape protection in CCDP 2022-2028 (Objective 8.1 and 8.25).

Additionally, it argues that CCDP 2022-2028, Objective 2.4, sets a principle of sequential development where new residential areas are only zoned where infrastructure capacity exists or is committed. There is no evidence that necessary infrastructure is in place or planned.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Stephen Lane</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1 – Sallybrook, Glanmire, on the basis that it would exacerbate an already unsafe road environment at the entrance to Glashaboy Woods, where poor visibility, difficult traffic conditions and near-miss incidents are regularly experienced, and where no junction or road safety improvements are proposed. The submitter is particularly concerned about increased risks to pedestrians and families with young children arising from additional construction and residential traffic.

The proposal would also place further pressure on already overstretched local infrastructure in the Glanmire/Sallybrook area, including schools, childcare, healthcare services and the road network, without any clear commitment to timely or adequate upgrades.

In addition, the rezoning would result in the loss of valuable green space that contributes to residential amenity, environmental quality and the character of the area. Given the proximity of the lands to the Glashaboy River and surrounding low-lying areas, unresolved flood risk and environmental concerns further undermine the suitability of the site for rezoning.

For these combined reasons, the submitter requests that the lands retain their existing ZO 17 Landscape Preservation zoning.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Claire Wallace</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the plans for 500 houses in the Crestfield/Hazelwood area, noting that the disruption would affect existing residents for years, that the roads cannot take increased traffic, and the extra traffic would cause safety issues for children playing outside. Finally, they highlight the current lack of facilities in the area (e.g. schools and creches) which would need to be addressed if further development went ahead.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kerrie Heffernan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning at Sallybrook, Glanmire (Zoning Ref. NE 1) based on the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rezoning this land for residential use would result in the loss of valuable greenfield space, with likely negative impacts on biodiversity, natural habitats, and the overall character and visual amenity of the area.</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence that the existing infrastructure could support a significant increase in housing. Public transport, drainage, schools, crèches, and healthcare services are already under pressure, and increasing demand would place additional strain on families and reduce overall quality of life in the area.</li> <li>• Road network under pressure and was not designed for such levels of use.</li> <li>• Traffic levels are currently high, and any future development would lead to a substantial increase in congestion which would impact existing communities. Concerns also raised about safety, particularly for residents and children.</li> <li>• Without clear planning around infrastructure, and in the absence of a comprehensive masterplan for the wider area, there is a risk that future development would be carried out in a piecemeal and uncoordinated way.</li> <li>• Priority should be given to protecting green areas and focusing development on brownfield or infill sites.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Laura Spillane</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (Zoning Ref. NE 1) on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission highlights safety issues within the Glashaboy View estate, noting that it was marketed as a completed cul-de-sac but remains in use by farm and construction vehicles, posing risks to residents, particularly children, which would increase with further development.</li> <li>• Concerns are raised about incomplete key infrastructure within the existing estate, including unfinished road surfacing and signage.</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submission emphasises the loss of greenfield land and its environmental value, stating that rezoning from ZO 17 Landscape Preservation would negatively affect biodiversity, natural habitats, and visual amenity.</li> <li>• It further highlights inadequate infrastructure capacity, noting that roads, public transport, drainage, schools, and healthcare services are already under strain and would be unable to support further development.</li> <li>• Increased flood risks are identified due to the site’s proximity to low-lying land and the river.</li> <li>• The submission argues that the proposed rezoning is premature in the absence of a comprehensive masterplan and warns of negative impacts on existing communities, including increased traffic, noise, and pressure on local services.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, it contends that the proposal is inconsistent with sustainable planning principles, particularly the protection of greenfield land and prioritisation of brownfield/infill development.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b></p>
<p>See Response Ref. 24</p>

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Matthew Marnell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1. The submission asks what has changed since 2022 when the lands were initially rezoned from Landscape Preservation to residential use, but government later overturned the decision on the basis that the lands were not suitable for housing.</p> <p>It raises concern that using the Crestfield/Hazelwood estate as an exit for any new development would significantly increase traffic on an already congested road network, and place excessive strain on already creaking infrastructure.</p> <p>Finally, the submission refers to Proposed Variation (No.3) report under “Future Growth 10.286” which sets out the significant infrastructure that Glanmire requires, and argues that this demonstrates the rezoning would exacerbate existing infrastructural deficiencies.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Hilary O’Donovan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of SW1 Lehenaghmore (SSO 4) based on the following key concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing road networks are already under pressure, and development would be premature pending completion of the Lehenaghmore Road Improvement Scheme. Recent works associated with the road scheme appear to include a pre-engineered entrance into this specific field which suggests that access arrangements may have been prepared before the statutory consultation on this rezoning has concluded. This is completely unacceptable.</li> <li>• The proposed rezoning represents a significant departure from the current zoning objectives (ZO 15 and ZO 20), with no clear evidence provided to justify the change.</li> </ul>			

- There are serious omissions in the Strategic Environmental Assessment, particularly in relation to biodiversity, habitats compliance, cultural heritage, flooding and drainage, landscape impact, and climate considerations. These lands are environmentally sensitive and not adequately assessed.
- The site has a proven history of flooding and contributes to an already constrained downstream culvert system. The absence of hydrological modelling or runoff assessment is a significant concern given the scale of development proposed.
- The area lacks the necessary infrastructure to support further development, including transport, schools, childcare, healthcare, and community services. No cumulative impact assessment has been provided.
- Cork Airport impacts: the site lies within the Outer Public Safety Zone (PSZ) and is subject to significant aircraft overflight. Noise, safety, and future land-use conflict issues have not been assessed, particularly in light of planned airport expansion.
- Key assessments (ecological, flood risk, infrastructure, PSZ analysis) have not been made available, limiting meaningful public participation. In line with the SEA Directive and the Aarhus Convention, the public is entitled to access the information underpinning planning decisions. We therefore request confirmation that the following were carried out, and reports for same:
  - ecological surveys
  - flood risk and drainage assessments
  - heritage assessments
  - Public Safety Zone analysis
  - infrastructure and cumulative impact studies
  - the rationale for rezoning this specific site within the City Hinterland lands
- Submission seeks the removal of the rezoning proposal. Should it proceed, the submission has outlined minimum safeguards including: phased infrastructure delivery; full independent assessments; appropriate density controls; and correction of factual errors.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**  
See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	39	From:	Nevan O’Driscoll
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission expresses concern at proposed rezoning of land on Maryborough Hill, highlighting the health & safety issue arising from the poor condition of the road, lack of footpath access, increased traffic, and cars speeding, all of which further development would exacerbate. Notes that a complete overhaul of the road system would be necessary before further development took place. In addition, the obliteration of the biodiversity prominent in the area would also impact negatively on residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Giny van der Burg</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands in the vicinity of Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates, Glanmire, Cork, on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would result in the loss of valuable green space, natural habitat and biodiversity. Highlights the presence of protected native red squirrels as evidence of the area’s ecological importance.</li> <li>• Development would increase traffic, noise, and disturbance to what is currently a quiet residential area which would reduce quality of life and raise safety concerns, particularly for children.</li> <li>• Proposal would exacerbate existing traffic congestion, increasing journey times, and creating safety risks for pedestrians and road users.</li> <li>• Existing road network is under considerable strain, and not designed to accommodate increased volumes.</li> <li>• Roads within Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates are narrow, lack adequate pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, and not designed to function as access routes for further developments. Cul-de-sacs and internal estate roads must not be used as through-roads for new developments. Absence of guaranteed infrastructure upgrades is an issue.</li> <li>• Infrastructure, transport capacity, and services are inadequate in this area. Proper planning requires that such infrastructure is delivered in advance of development, not as a consequence of it.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ger Manley (withdrawn)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN DUE TO DUPLICATION REFER TO SUBMISSION CRK-C378-CDPV3-13			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Shawn Craig</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield and Hazelwood Estate in Glanmire, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased density would inevitably bring more noise, congestion, and general disruption to what are currently quiet residential estates.</li> <li>• Particular concern is raised regarding traffic and safety for residents, children, pedestrians and cyclists. The local road network is already heavily used and not designed to accommodate increased traffic from additional development. Increased traffic, and having new entrances through the terraces, poses particular risk to the children who play on the green space and on the roads in the cul de sacs. Access should not be routed through these estates as the roads are unsuitable for through-traffic and such use would undermine safety and residential amenity.</li> </ul>			

- There is also a lack of supporting infrastructure in Glanmire, which has not kept pace with development. New development would exacerbate the pressure put on local services such as schools, healthcare services and community facilities, as well as parking and transport infrastructure.
- The importance of the land as green space and wildlife habitat is also highlighted, with concern that its loss would negatively affect both the environment and community wellbeing.

The submission concludes that development must be properly planned and supported by adequate infrastructure and local amenities.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mario Prodromou</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of SW 1 and SW 2 Lehenaghmore from ZO 21 (City Hinterland) to ZO 2 (New Residential Neighbourhood) under Variation No. 3, as the proposal is premature and contrary to proper planning.

The local road network is already at capacity, and effective public transport cannot be realistically provided due to the area’s steep topography.

Both sites also lack essential services and amenities, meaning the rezoning does not meet national requirements for infrastructure led development and raises serious planning and legal concerns.

In addition, development of SW 1 would remove an important greenfield area that currently absorbs surface water, increasing flood risk to established residential areas downstream in Togher, where the existing drainage system already operates close to capacity, while also blocking the planned route of the Cork Southern Distributor Road.

For these reasons, the proposed rezoning is unsustainable, and both lands should be removed from Variation No. 3 and retained as ZO 21 (City Hinterland).

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Stephen Howard</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, for the following reasons:

- Concern that the proposed rezoning would place excessive pressure on the Glanmire area, which is already experiencing strain on roads and local services.
- Existing traffic congestion, which additional housing without corresponding road improvements would worsen for residents.
- Concerns are raised about the lack of clear plans to expand schools, healthcare, and other essential services, suggesting that infrastructure is not keeping pace with potential population growth.
- The importance of preserving the green space at Sallybrook is emphasised, noting its contribution to the quality of life in the area.

- Flood risk is identified as an issue to the site and nearby homes owing to the proximity of the lands to the river.
- Finally, the submission notes the absence of a comprehensive masterplan for the wider area, expressing concern that piecemeal development could create long-term problems for the area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Liam Keating</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, highlighting that this zoning was previously proposed in 2022, but later overturned by government. Existing traffic flow through the area is significant and would be exacerbated by new development, thereby putting even more pressure on the dangerous exit at the end of the Hill on to Hazelwood Road. Concern is expressed that not enough thought has been given to the infrastructure required to support these developments.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Pat Murphy</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission from a local resident to oppose the re zoning of lands adjacent to Glashaboy Heights, Sallybrook, Glanmire.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Paul O’Sullivan</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, and requests that the current Landscape Preservation designation be maintained to protect the environmental and residential qualities of the area. The following concerns are raised:

- Existing zoning safeguards a valuable green area that contributes to the visual amenity, biodiversity, and overall environmental quality of the locality, which would all be lost with proposed zoning, thereby undermining sustainable development objectives.
- Intensified development adjacent to established housing could negatively impact residential amenity through overlooking, reduced privacy, increased noise, and general disturbance.
- Additional development would exacerbate the pressure that local roads and junctions are under, and place further strain on schools, drainage systems, and public services.
- Concerns are expressed about potential impacts on natural drainage and increased flood risk due to the site’s proximity to green corridors and water features.

- There is a lack of clarity regarding the delivery of supporting infrastructure, suggesting that rezoning at this stage is premature and not aligned with a coordinated planning approach.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Shane O’Connor</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Glanmire from Landscape Preservation Zone ZO 17, to New Residential Neighbourhood ZO 02.

- The submission maintains that the rezoning is inconsistent with an earlier planning decision made during the draft plan stage of the City Development Plan 2022-28, where the same lands were deemed unsuitable for development due to their ecological, visual, screening, and landscape importance. Concern is expressed that no meaningful change has occurred to justify reversing this position, aside from housing demand, and that this sets a negative precedent for planning.
- The submission contends that housing figures can be increased by facilitating existing permissions, noting that only 47% of units in Commencement Notices have submitted Completion Certificates.
- The submission asserts that the proposed site is unsuitable for development due to its constrained and landlocked nature, requiring access through existing residential estates (Glashaboy estates, and Hazelwood/Crestfield), with expected significant movement of construction materials and machinery for a significant period of time.
- The submission highlights existing significant issues within these estates, contending that many key elements required under previous planning permissions have not been completed or properly implemented, including infrastructure such as pedestrian walkways/accesses, vehicles access, traffic calming measures. In addition, a number of planning enforcement cases have been opened.
- Fundamentally the entire estate relies on a singular access out of the three estates to the R639 and wider Glanmire to the west. The lack of existing infrastructure in the existing development which would only be compounded by the reliance of another larger housing estate on singular access.
- Doubts are raised about the realism of projected housing density and delivery, given the site’s topography, visibility, environmental sensitivity, and proximity to the M8 motorway. It is argued that the site is unlikely to contribute meaningfully to housing targets.
- Environmental concerns are emphasised, noting the site is the only one proposed which currently has a LPZ zoning. The lack of detailed environmental assessment in the variation for this site is identified as a key deficiency.
- The submission also highlights concerns about inadequate social infrastructure in Glanmire, which has not kept pace with development, and would be exacerbated by further development, including limited school capacity, healthcare access, and childcare availability.
- In addition, the road infrastructure is deficient and underprovided to support existing residents let alone the significant increase that would come with new development.

Overall, the submission concludes that the proposal is unsustainable, would place undue strain on existing infrastructure and communities, and is not supported by adequate evidence or planning justification.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tom O’Connor</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Riverstown for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rezoning this site was previously rejected on 2 separate occasions: once by the Minister for Housing owing to the landlocked site and a single access point; and again when it was within Cork County Council’s boundary due to greenbelt zoning laws.</li> <li>• The submission argues that Hazelwood and Crestfield estates were designed as final developments with narrow roads and limited infrastructure, making them unsuitable to accommodate the significant increase in traffic that would result from a new development. It highlights safety concerns, particularly for the many young residents who use local green spaces, suggesting that increased traffic could lead to serious accidents.</li> <li>• Environmental concerns are also raised, noting the unique setting of the proposed site between the Glashaboy and Butlerstown rivers. It is argued that development could disrupt natural drainage, increase flood risk, and negatively impact important salmon and sea trout habitats. The presence of mature trees, hedgerows, and stone walls supporting local biodiversity is also emphasised, with the development described as potentially harmful to the local ecosystem.</li> <li>• Finally, the submission acknowledges the need for housing but contends that Glanmire has already experienced significant and continuous development, with further large-scale housing already planned. It argues that additional rezoning should not proceed until existing issues such as traffic congestion, pollution, and inadequate local facilities are addressed.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jennette Field (Withdrawn)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN DUE TO DUPLICATION REFER TO SUBMISSION CRK-C378-CDPV3-52			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sarah Meighan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission seeks the inclusion of 4.66 hectares of land at Banduff Road, opposite Lios Rua in Ballyvolane (CK21290), for future residential zoning within the Ballyvolane expansion area.</p> <p>It argues that the lands form a natural extension of the existing Lios Rua residential estate; are located within a strategic growth zone, and benefit from significant planned infrastructure, including the Banduff Road Scheme and the proposed Cork Northern Distributor Multi-Modal Route (CNDMR).</p> <p>While acknowledging that parts of the land may be subject to CPO for the CNDMR, the submission maintains that this should not hinder recognition of the site’s long-term</p>			

development potential. It highlights that, once infrastructure plans are finalised, the lands will have improved access and connectivity, making them well-suited for housing.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 41

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jennette Field</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in the Sallybrook area. It highlights existing traffic congestion in the Crestfield and surrounding area, which would be exacerbated by further development, and would in turn be a danger for children playing in and around the green areas.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Aisling O’Neill</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at SW1 and SW2 Lehenaghmore on the grounds that existing physical, social, and transport infrastructure in Lehenaghmore and the wider Togher area is already inadequate. The area experiences significant traffic congestion, limited public transport, car dependency, and a lack of basic amenities such as schools, healthcare services, shops, playgrounds, safe cycling infrastructure, and continuous footpaths. As a long-term resident raising a young family, the submission highlights that daily travel to schools and childcare already relies on unsafe cycling and road conditions. The proposed rezoning is considered inconsistent with the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 objectives, particularly the “15-Minute City” model and the principle of infrastructure-led development, neither of which are currently met in the area.

The submission also raises serious ecological and strategic planning concerns. The lands in question form an important greenfield ecological corridor supporting protected species and local biodiversity, and their loss would further reduce already scarce open space.

Additionally, part of the SW1 site aligns with the indicative route of the Cork South Distributor Road, and rezoning it for residential use could permanently sterilise a strategically important future transport corridor needed to relieve wider city congestion. On this basis, the submission concludes that rezoning is premature, unsustainable, and contrary to long-term planning, transport, and environmental objectives.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sinead Egan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield/Hazelwood in Glanmire owing to concerns regarding the impact this proposal would have on the area and on existing residents.</p> <p>It highlights existing traffic congestion and road safety issues, particularly during school hours, arguing that the current road network cannot support additional housing without major upgrades. It also raises environmental concerns, noting that increased development would worsen noise and air pollution from the nearby motorway.</p> <p>The submission further emphasises the importance of preserving greenfield land, which currently provides open space, supports biodiversity, maintains the area’s character, and offers natural screening. Its loss would change the character of the area and reduce an amenity for residents’.</p> <p>Overall, the submission concludes that the rezoning is unsustainable and premature given the current strain on local infrastructure.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Yvonne O’Brien</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhoods. The resident argues that the proposal conflicts with planning policy and lacks adequate supporting infrastructure. Key concerns include existing traffic congestion, insufficient public transport, drainage, flooding and subsidence issues, and a lack of planning for essential services such as schools, childcare and healthcare. The submission also highlights negative environmental impacts, including loss of biodiversity, increased pollution, reduced pedestrian safety, and the loss of an important greenbelt. The resident suggests that rezoning the land for sports and recreational use, such as a Regional Park, would be a more sustainable alternative that would benefit the wider Douglas community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Orla Twomey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at SW1 Lehenaghmore under Proposed Variation No. 3, as it represents premature and unsustainable development that is entirely disconnected from existing realities on the ground.</p> <p>Lehenaghmore suffers from a severe and measurable deficit in infrastructure and amenities: there is no shop, GP, pharmacy, crèche, park, community space, or reliable public transport, forcing total dependence on private cars.</p>			

Traffic conditions are already extreme, with school journeys that should take minutes routinely taking up to 30 minutes, and during recent road closures, up to 2.5 hours, an intolerable situation for families, particularly those with children with additional needs who rely on predictable routines and specialist transport that has already proven unworkable.

The proposed zoning ignores National Planning Framework requirements for serviced or serviceable land, risks leapfrog development, and relies on unrealistic assumptions about future bus and active travel provision despite steep gradients, physical pinch points, and demonstrable service refusals.

Environmentally, the 11.4-hectare greenfield site currently functions as a critical flood attenuation “sponge” feeding into the Tramore River and newly constructed Togher flood defences, which already operate with minimal freeboard; rezoning exposes downstream estates to serious flood risk reminiscent of historic flooding events. The site is also an important ecological corridor supporting legally protected species, while its elevated plateau forms part of Cork’s southern ridgeline, the development of which would cause permanent landscape and visual harm.

Taken cumulatively, Lehenaghmore has exceeded its social absorption capacity, with repeated residential intensification unsupported by delivery of community infrastructure, contrary to the 15-minute city model. For these reasons, the rezoning of SW1 and associated lands should be removed from Proposed Variation No. 3 and retained as open space/hinterland.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	57	From:	Elaine O’Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission contends that the proposed rezoning of lands at SW1 and SW2 Lehenaghmore is premature and unsustainable, given the severe lack of supporting infrastructure and amenities in the area.			
There is no adequate public transport, healthcare, retail, recreational facilities, or quality public open space, and local schools are already under pressure. The road network is operating beyond capacity, with persistent congestion and safety concerns, and proposed bus route expansions are impractical due to steep gradients and the absence of safe turning points, resulting in over-reliance on private cars.			
The 11.4 hectares of greenfield land currently act as a critical natural flood attenuation area; its development would significantly increase surface water runoff, posing a serious flood risk to lower-lying neighbourhoods and Togher village.			
The rezoning would also destroy established wildlife habitats and introduce an inappropriate scale, density, and design that is wholly out of character with the existing area.			
Past local experience shows a pattern of intensified development contrary to original plans, eroding community trust. For these reasons, and noting the mapping error in Objective SW1, it is requested that SW1 Lehenaghmore and SW2 Lehenaghmore be removed from Draft Variation No. 3.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jim O’Mahony</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the proposed rezoning of additional lands in Kerry Pike Village (NW3). Submission notes that there has been a huge increase in new houses in the last 5/6 years, but infrastructure has not been improved to cater for the existing residents: there are no footpaths linking either side of the Village; the proposed Pedestrian Scheme has been on hold for years; the Road network is completely inadequate for the level of traffic, with congestion at peak times; and there is no bus service to the area so new residents would be car dependent.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jennifer Minihane</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission regarding proposed rezoning of site in Kerry Pike. Contends that infrastructure in Kerry Pike is not suitable for the amount of houses that would be built on 8 acres; that major improvements are needed on roads and public transportation; and that traffic management is needed by Lee Road/Leemount.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Patrick Hourihane</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objecting to the re-zoning of land in Kerry Pike adjacent to Millboro. Submission states that Kerry Pike has experienced significant housing growth in recent years without improvements in local infrastructure. Kerry Pike already has a high volume of traffic; there are no public connections; and there are regular power cuts and water issues which all indicate that the area cannot cope with additional housing.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rory O’Connor</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission expresses strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of land at Millboro in Kerry Pike for residential development. They state that significant housing growth has already occurred without adequate infrastructure improvements, leading to deteriorating conditions for residents. Key concerns include unmanageable and unsafe traffic; recurring water outages and discoloration; and frequent power outages that have affected ability to work and care for babies. The lack of local amenities such as shops, childcare, public transport, and safe pedestrian access has left the area isolated and effectively car-dependent despite long-promised bus and pedestrian improvements that have yet to materialise. The submission concludes that additional housing development cannot be tolerated and also notes that the			

proposed Northern Ring Road was previously mooted to traverse land in or adjacent to the proposed rezoning.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Aisling Parkes</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission raises strong concerns about continued and proposed housing development in the Kerry Pike-Clonlara area without the delivery of promised and essential local amenities. Despite significant recent residential growth, infrastructure has not kept pace. Footpaths are limited, narrow, poorly maintained, and in some locations entirely absent, forcing pedestrians (often with small children) to walk on dangerous and heavily trafficked roads. There is no continuous footpath through the village, no public transport provision, and the road network is unsafe and overstretched, with severe congestion during peak hours, regular potholes, and added hazards from heavy goods vehicles accessing nearby sites. The submission expresses serious safety concerns and fears that it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs.

In addition, the area lacks basic services for families, most notably local childcare facilities, requiring residents to travel long distances by car and further exacerbating traffic problems. The submission highlights frustration and loss of trust due to unfulfilled commitments to provide amenities for young families. While supportive of housing development in principle, the submission argues that further development without targeted investment in traffic infrastructure, footpaths, public transport, and childcare would be reckless and disrespectful to the existing community. The key request is that public amenities and infrastructure be prioritised and delivered before any further housing is facilitated, and that the concerns of local residents be genuinely listened to and acted upon.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Martin McAuliffe</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in the Maryborough Hill/Moneygourney area owing to inadequate supporting infrastructure. The submission highlights serious concerns about worsening traffic congestion and road safety, which additional traffic from new development would exacerbate; unresolved drainage and recurrent flooding issues, which the submitter has personally experienced; insufficient water pressure and supply interruptions; and a lack of public recreational and amenity spaces which could cause social problems in the future.

The proposal is also criticised for conflicting with the Compact Growth principle and the Regional Spatial Strategy by promoting greenfield development instead of focusing on brownfield and built-up areas.

The submission concludes that the objection is not anti-housing but calls for essential infrastructure and community amenities to be addressed before any rezoning proceeds, and urges councillors to reject the proposal on these grounds.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jazz Glennon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed re-zoning of land in Kerry Pike adjacent to the Millboro development, as the area has already undergone significant residential growth in recent years without the necessary investment in supporting infrastructure. Traffic volumes are already high, public transport provision remains extremely limited, and residents continue to experience recurring power outages and water supply disruptions, all of which indicate that existing services are under considerable strain. In these circumstances, the current infrastructure is clearly inadequate to support additional housing, and further residential development would be unsustainable and detrimental to the quality of life of existing residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Andrew Cronin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission strongly objects to the rezoning of proposed site in Kerry Pike for development. In recent years, Kerry Pike has already seen the construction of hundreds of homes across multiple housing estates, yet this growth has not been matched by any meaningful improvement in local infrastructure or essential services. The area is now clearly over capacity, with extremely poor road conditions, severe traffic congestion, widespread speeding, and a complete lack of footpaths, traffic calming measures, and safe pedestrian crossings. A promised pedestrian scheme has not been delivered, leaving residents, particularly children and older people, at serious risk.</p> <p>In addition, Kerry Pike lacks basic services required to support further housing. There are no local childcare facilities, no public transport, and the primary school is at full capacity with insufficient places for local children. Residents also experience frequent power cuts and water outages. Kerry Pike cannot accommodate any additional housing development unless there are significant, upfront improvements to infrastructure and the delivery of critical services. The current road and pedestrian conditions are extremely dangerous, and it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured, or worse, if these issues are not addressed first.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Anne Cowley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission expresses concern at proposed rezoning of land in Crestfield Estate area, pointing to major traffic issues with exiting the Hazelwood estate, and highlighting the major delays in exiting from the bottom of the hill owing to nearby schools and shopping centre. Also points out that there is currently only one access route to the land, which will need to be addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nicholas Scott</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission recognises the need for increased housing but objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Riverstown, arguing that Glanmire has already reached capacity and is unsuitable for further large-scale development due to infrastructure and geographic limitations.</p> <p>Infrastructure Limitations: Existing amenities, including the shopping centre and local road network, are not adequate to support additional population growth or increased traffic demands.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport Concerns: The Sallybrook/Hazelwood area already experiences significant congestion, even after recent flood relief works. Proposed road links (via Glashaboy and Crestfield to Hazelwood) would channel large volumes of additional traffic through residential estates not designed for such use. This would worsen daily congestion, especially with existing pressures from motorway diversion traffic and school activity. It would also increase noise, vibration, and introduce larger vehicles into residential areas.</p> <p>Environmental and Community Impact: The rezoning threatens well-maintained green spaces in Hazelwood and Crestfield, which are valued community amenities. These areas include mature trees, historic stone walls, and habitats supporting wildlife such as hares, foxes, hedgehogs, and various bird species. Development would result in the loss of these natural and recreational assets.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nicole Fitzgibbon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro Kerry Pike for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kerry Pike's infrastructure, traffic management, facilities and services have not expanded in line with the growth seen in the village in recent years.</li> <li>• No expansion in primary school despite population growth, and no designated “feeder” secondary school for the area.</li> <li>• There is no public transport or safe pedestrian access to nearby towns.</li> <li>• There have been many occasions where the residents of the village have been without water and electricity</li> <li>• The condition of the roads</li> <li>• No traffic management system in place. Particularly the road by Leemount (The Anglers) is terribly congested at peak times as is.</li> <li>• There is no shop in the area and no footpath in place to walk to one.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sets out their role under the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations in promoting the full and transparent integration of environmental assessment findings into the development plan. It clarifies that while the EPA provides guidance and recommendations it neither approves nor enforces SEAs or plans. The submission recommends that Cork City Council ensures that the Variation aligns with key relevant higher-level plans and programmes and is consistent with the relevant objectives and policy commitments of the National Planning Framework and the Southern Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy. The submission sets out the content of an SEA environmental report, referring to mitigation and monitoring, and advocates using the Environmental Monitoring approach referenced in Table 7.1 of the National Planning Framework’s First Revision SEA Statement in this regard. The submission sets out the SEA requirements for subsequent stages of the process and the relevant statutory consultees that should form part of the consultation process.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 5			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ann O’Mahony</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission opposes the proposed rezoning of additional lands in Kerry Pike for the following reasons: traffic congestion on all routes; safety issues owing to lack of footpath/cycle connections; existing water and electric supply issues which would be exacerbated by further development; and lack of bus connections which contributes to congestion.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Karen Matthews</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Flooding and Hydrology:</b> The submission includes photographic evidence of surface and groundwater events on their property which is stated originates from the land proposed for rezoning which presently has poor drainage characteristics. Reference is made to the maintenance of a dike on the submitter’s property and that rezoning the land would result in extensive impermeable surfaces being introduced to the site which increase surface water runoff and drainage pressure onto the neighbouring sites.</li> <li>2. <b>Light Pollution:</b> Concerns are raised regarding the introduction of potentially causing light pollution that would decrease both the amenity value of the area and ecological benefit the area receives currently by its lack of artificial lighting.</li> <li>3. <b>Noise pollution:</b> Concerns regarding noise disturbance associated with a multi-year construction programme is also raised. The submission also outlines Objective (j) of the Site Specific Objectives will introduce a new road connecting the site to Douglas Hall which would generate generating traffic, noise and air pollution affecting neighbouring properties.</li> </ol>			

4. **Environmental and Biodiversity Impact:** The submission outlines that the site forms part of the greenbelt surrounding Cork and supports a rich variety of habitats and species and that development would cause a significant irreversible impact on local biodiversity. Reference is made to potential active Badger Setts and their associated protection as well as other protected species
  5. **Road infrastructure and Transport Safety:** It is submitted that the current road network is already operating beyond capacity with significant congestion at peak hours and that any new large-scale development without a clear deliverable transport solution would raise serious concerns. Submission acknowledges Site-Specific Objective (ii) requiring active travel and (i) requires vehicular access however states that the proposal doesn’t demonstrate how existing road network will be upgraded.
  6. **Deficit in community facilities, services and amenities:** The submission expresses concern around public amenities in the Douglas area with specific concerns around primary schools, early years and childcare, GP and healthcare services and green space and public amenity.
  7. **Cumulative impacts of extant planning permissions:** The submission raises concerns over the cumulative impact of existing major developments occurring in the vicinity of the site with particular regard to the road network, drainage infrastructure, open space and access to education and healthcare facilities that cannot be adequately assessed prior to their delivery. Submission requests a comprehensive audit of all extant planning permissions within the study area.
- It is recommended by the submitter that reports and assessments are carried out on the majority of items raised.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**  
See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rebecca Hutchinson</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Kerry Pike for further housing on the grounds that existing infrastructure has already been pushed beyond capacity. While the submission supports housing development in principle, they state that the current scale and pace of growth has resulted in unsustainable traffic congestion, with peak-time journeys to the South Link Road regularly taking 30-40 minutes. This congestion negatively affects daily commuting, school runs, quality of life, and potentially emergency access.</p> <p>The submission further highlights deficiencies in pedestrian infrastructure, lack of public transport, ongoing pressure on water and utility services, and recurring power outages. The core concern is that additional large-scale residential development should not proceed until these fundamental infrastructure and service issues are properly addressed, with meaningful upgrades delivered in advance of any further rezoning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brian Walsh</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns around the capacity of existing infrastructure in Kerry Pike, highlighting ongoing issues such as frequent water outages and burst pipes, significant traffic congestion on deteriorating roads, and the absence of any public transport options. With the area already operating beyond what current systems can support, the addition of approximately 100 new homes, and an estimated 200 extra cars, is expected to place further strain on an already overwhelmed network, making the development unsustainable without substantial prior investment in essential services.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Niall Buckley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (Sites SW1 and SW2). The submitter lives adjacent to Site SW1 and argues that the proposal does not reflect existing site constraints or local conditions.</p> <p>Key concerns include increased flood risk due to the loss of permeable greenfield lands, with historic flooding issues in adjacent laneways not fully resolved by the Togher flood relief scheme. The submission notes that the rezoning would conflict with the current Local Area Development Plan, which designates the lands as open space or agricultural due to drainage limitations.</p> <p>The submission also highlights severe traffic congestion, inadequate road access, and safety concerns, alongside insufficient capacity in schools, healthcare, childcare, and recreational facilities. It raises concerns about impacts on residential amenity, biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and the established character of the area.</p> <p>The lack of effective public transport is cited, with the submission stating that the proposed bus corridor is not viable or capable of operating efficiently given existing road constraints. The submission requests that rezoning be refused until flood management, traffic solutions, community infrastructure, and a workable public transport option are delivered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Horgan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, stating that local infrastructure, traffic management, facilities and services, have not expanded in line with recent growth. Key concerns include: the lack of public transport; frequent water and electricity outages; poor road conditions; insufficient footpaths, with no footpath connecting the village west-east; and a lack of local shops. The submission contends that no further housing development should proceed until these infrastructure issues are urgently addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Derrick Healy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1 Glanmire from landscape preservation (ZO17) to residential use (ZO2), on the basis that it would undermine environmental protection, strain infrastructure, and negatively impact existing communities. There would be a loss of character and amenity value, the land is currently designated for preservation due to its natural beauty, distinctive landscape, and potential historical significance. As the physical characteristics of the area remain unchanged, there is no justification for removing this protection. The local infrastructure in Glanmire/Sallybrook, including roads, schools, and social services, is already at or near capacity. The area’s topography further limits sustainable transport options. The rezoning of this land ahead of necessary infrastructure upgrades would be inconsistent with sustainable development principles. Any redevelopment would have an impact on Existing Communities: Development would significantly increase traffic on already busy and hazardous roads, particularly in adjoining estates of Glashaboy Woods, View, and Heights, where visibility is poor in places. The submission concludes by calling for the retention of the ZO17 zoning, emphasising that preserving the land as protected green space is in the best long-term interest of the community and supports balanced, sustainable development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Carol Craig</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed housing development between Crestfield and Sallybrook in Glanmire noting that the area has already experienced significant population growth without any expansion in facilities. The submission highlights increasing pressure on healthcare, education and recreational facilities noting that further development would worsen existing issues, in particular limited school capacity. The submission suggests that by routing estate access through an unsuitable entrance, this proposal would make the green spaces in the estate less safe. Concern is expressed that the lack of recreational spaces and activities for children in Glanmire may lead to antisocial behaviour in the future and the loss of community spirit. Local amenities are already overstretched, with limited clubs/sports availability. The submission requests that no new housing estates be developed without adequate services and infrastructure (e.g. schools, recreation outdoor space, an adequate and expanded transport system) being provided.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mary Buckley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (Sites SW1 and SW2), currently zoned as greenfield/agricultural and open space lands. It is argued that the rezoning would conflict with the objectives of the existing Local Area Development Plan.</p>			

The submission raises concerns regarding increased flood risk due to loss of permeable land, which currently absorbs rainfall and mitigates surface water runoff affecting nearby laneways and dwellings. Significant traffic congestion already exists on the Togher Road and access routes to the N40, and further development is stated to pose additional safety risks and delays for all road users.

Concerns are also raised regarding the lack of local amenities, public transport, and community facilities, as well as the loss of mature trees, hedgerows, and impacts on local wildlife.

The submission requests that the rezoning not proceed until adequate road, drainage, transport, and community infrastructure is provided.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	79	From:	Iain McGregor
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to further housing development in Kerry Pike, highlighting that the area has expanded rapidly from 174 homes in 2018 to 623 by 2026 without corresponding infrastructure investment. Roads and footpaths have significantly deteriorated, many newer estates lack safe pedestrian links to the village, and children are forced to walk on dangerous public roads. Promised infrastructure measures, including a pedestrian scheme and BusConnects, have been repeatedly delayed or shelved, with no start dates, budgets, or timelines now in place for footpaths, road resurfacing, or traffic calming. Despite community protests and clear safety risks, developments approved on the basis of these improvements are already complete, while Cork City Council is now proposing additional housing on unzoned land. The core concern is that Kerry Pike has exceeded its fair share of housing growth, and that priority must now be given to making the existing community safe before any further development is considered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	80	From:	Greg Collins
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore, Togher (SW1 and SW2). The submission states that rezoning could enable up to 650 additional dwellings in an area already lacking adequate road, pedestrian, transport, and community infrastructure.</p> <p>Lehenaghmore is described as experiencing severe traffic congestion, unsafe conditions for pedestrians, and over-reliance on private cars, arising from long-term development without timely infrastructure delivery. The area now functions as a major traffic corridor, negatively impacting residents’ safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>The submission requests that further rezoning be paused until essential physical and social infrastructure, public transport, and safe walking and cycling routes are provided, and calls for a comprehensive master plan to guide sustainable future development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Dr Declan King</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the grounds that existing infrastructure, services, and transport capacity are already under severe strain following significant residential growth in recent years. Key concerns include chronic traffic congestion on all approach roads, particularly near Leemount (The Anglers), an inadequate and unsafe road network, and the absence of any public transport, forcing complete car dependency. The area lacks continuous footpaths and safe pedestrian or cycling links within the village or to neighbouring areas, posing serious safety risks for residents, especially children. Utilities are reported as unreliable, with repeated water and electricity outages, while community infrastructure has failed to keep pace, including insufficient school capacity, no designated secondary school feeder, and no safely accessible local shop. The overarching concern is that further housing development would be unfair, unsafe, and unsustainable unless substantial investment is first made in roads, traffic management, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, public transport, utilities, schools, and local services.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Dr Hatice King</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning in the Kerry Pike area, highlighting that local infrastructure is unable to cope with any additional housing projects as the residents are currently dealing with daily traffic congestion, lack of public transport connections or safe footpath and cycling routes.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kieran Kelly</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Moneygourney from city hinterland to residential neighbourhoods, citing as a primary concern the existing traffic congestion in the area and the strained road infrastructure. They believe that additional large-scale housing development would exacerbate traffic issues, increase delays, and pose greater safety risks to pedestrians and cyclists. They also highlight a lack of adequate supporting amenities and infrastructure, suggesting that the area has already experienced significant housing growth without corresponding investment in services. The submission warns that continued development could lead to further disruption and negatively impact the local community. Additionally, they express concern about the ongoing loss of green spaces, emphasising their importance for community wellbeing, biodiversity, recreation, and preserving the character of the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Alan O’Donoghue</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire, for a development of over 500 houses. The area has already seen significant development, leading to increased traffic and congestion. The narrow roads cannot support further growth, and additional development is expected to worsen congestion, increase safety risks to pedestrians and vehicles, and strain infrastructure that was never designed for such a population. The proposal is therefore opposed to protect community safety and quality of life.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Catherine Revins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the land near Hazelwood/Crestfield Glanmire, noting that these estates are quiet, safe, long-established estates, and that a large-scale development on adjacent land would significantly alter the character of the area, bringing noise, congestion and disruption. The nearby green space is used by local children and with current traffic levels is already dangerous, but additional traffic would create even greater safety risks. Introducing access routes through these areas would negatively impact the community. Submission highlights traffic congestion in the roads in and around Glanmire, which more vehicles would exacerbate and which creates serious safety risks for residents especially children, pedestrians and cyclists.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Luke Miller</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike. While recognising the need to increase housing supply, the submission argues that the rezoning is premature and unsustainable.			
It highlights inadequate infrastructure, including constrained road capacity, traffic congestion, safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, and the absence of adequate public transport, which would result in continued car dependency. Concerns are also raised regarding the lack of confirmed capacity in water, wastewater, drainage, schools, healthcare, and community facilities.			
The submission further contends that significant residential development would erode the rural character of Kerry Pike, result in loss of green buffer lands and biodiversity, and contribute to unsustainable suburban sprawl. It concludes that housing delivery should instead be prioritised on existing serviced and underutilised lands within the city and requests that the Kerry Pike rezoning be removed from Variation No. 3.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	87	From:	Lucy Gaffney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission concerns the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas, from City Hinterland (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2). It is argued that the lands currently function as part of a greenbelt that buffers the urban area and contributes to environmental and community value.</p> <p>Significant concerns are raised regarding the proposal’s alignment with planning policy, infrastructure capacity, environmental protection, drainage, transport, and sustainable development objectives. It is suggested that the rezoning does not conform to key national, regional, and local planning frameworks, which emphasise compact growth, infrastructure-led development, biodiversity protection, and the avoidance of urban sprawl.</p> <p>The rezoning is considered premature, as adequate supporting infrastructure, particularly in relation to roads, drainage, and community amenities, has not been demonstrated. It is also stated that sufficient residential capacity already exists within zoned and serviced lands elsewhere in Cork City.</p> <p>Conflict with compact growth policies is highlighted, as the development of undeveloped greenfield land is viewed as contributing to suburban expansion rather than consolidation of existing urban areas.</p> <p>Environmental concerns are identified, including potential impacts on biodiversity, habitat connectivity, hydrology, and landscape character. It is noted that no clear evidence has been provided to demonstrate that such impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>Concerns regarding flooding and drainage are also outlined, with it being stated that existing issues in the area would likely be exacerbated by increased surface water runoff and pressure on drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposal is described as piecemeal and developer-led, lacking integration into a broader strategic plan for the area. Existing local pressures, such as traffic congestion, inadequate infrastructure, flooding, and limited green space, are highlighted as already significant.</p> <p>It is proposed that the lands should instead be protected for recreational and community use, which would support local amenities, biodiversity, and quality of life. The importance of nearby facilities, including Douglas Hall AFC, is emphasised.</p> <p>It is recommended that any decision on rezoning be deferred until a future planning review, allowing for comprehensive infrastructure assessment, environmental analysis, and community engagement.</p> <p>In conclusion, the rezoning is considered premature, unsupported by infrastructure, inconsistent with compact growth policy, environmentally uncertain, and likely to exacerbate existing pressures. It is requested that the rezoning not proceed at this time and that alternative uses or a deferred, plan-led assessment be considered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin Gaffney</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes the rezoning of City Hinterland lands (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2) at Moneygourney, Douglas. It recognises the need for additional housing but does not believe this site represents an appropriate or sustainable location for residential expansion at this time. Serious concerns are raised in relation to capacity, flooding and drainage, traffic, biodiversity, and consistency with wider planning, leading to fragmented suburban expansion.</p> <p>The submission states that the proposal, which is peripheral and greenfield in nature, appears to conflict with principles set out in regional and national planning policies (RSES, Cork City Development Plan, national biodiversity and sustainable development guidelines), which prioritise compact, infrastructure-led growth and discourages urban sprawl.</p> <p>It is submitted that there are existing pressures on local infrastructure which would be increased with additional residential development including traffic congestion, road safety, and deficient pedestrian infrastructure. Concerns are also raised regarding the cumulative impact of multiple developments across the wider area.</p> <p>Concerns are raised regarding exacerbation of repeated concerns regarding drainage and flooding, in particular increased surface water runoff as a result of recent development activity and flooding onto Moneygourney Road, with no apparent flood mitigation strategy evident.</p> <p>Concerns are raised regarding the potential impact on environmental and landscape value with a view that rezoning should only occur when there is a clear strategic and infrastructural basis for doing so, which does not appear to be demonstrated in this case.</p> <p>Concerns are expressed regarding the need for recreational and public open space against significant population growth in the area. It is stated that the adjoining Douglas Hall lands represents an important local amenity and consideration should be given to safeguarding this opportunity for community use and active recreation</p> <p>It is proposed that the lands should be considered through the next review of the local planning framework to allow for proper strategic consideration and meaningful public consultation.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John O’Sullivan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises strong concerns about further rezoning for housing in the Kerry Pike/Clogheen area, stating that recent large-scale residential development has not been matched by the delivery of basic infrastructure and services. A primary issue is pedestrian safety, with no continuous footpath through the village, repeatedly delayed pedestrian schemes, incomplete “bit-part” footpaths, and a lack of safe crossing points. This creates dangerous conditions for children, families, older residents, and those with impaired mobility, and is considered inconsistent with national road user hierarchy principles that prioritise pedestrians and inclusive access. The submission argues that permitting further housing without resolving these issues represents a failure in duty of care to existing and future residents.</p> <p>Additional concerns relate to traffic, services, and sustainability. The local road network, particularly the L2779, is described as operating beyond capacity due to through-traffic, car dependency arising from the absence of public transport, and ongoing construction traffic.</p>			

Speeding, congestion, potholes, and road surface deterioration are highlighted as ongoing safety risks, with promised traffic-calming measures repeatedly delayed. The submission also points to water and sewer networks already operating at or beyond capacity, recurring leaks and outages, a lack of childcare facilities and local commercial services, and the complete absence of public transport, cycling infrastructure, and active travel alternatives. Overall, the position is that further rezoning would be unsustainable and would negatively impact quality of life unless essential infrastructure and services are upgraded and delivered in advance.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Patrick O’Brien</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NW3 Kerry Pike/Millboro for residential development on the grounds that it is premature and not supported by adequate infrastructure. While the submission is not opposed to housing in principle, it contends that Kerry Pike already lacks the transport, road safety, pedestrian, cycling, public transport, school, and local service capacity needed to support further growth. Existing roads are operating under strain, pedestrian and cycling conditions are described as unsafe, and key routes such as Upper Leemount Road, Prospect Hill, and the L2779 are poorly surfaced and hostile to active travel. Planned public transport improvements are not yet operational, and junctions in the area already experience congestion and conflict at peak times.

The submission also raises concerns about limited school capacity, insufficiently robust development safeguards, and the risk of rezoning land without firm commitments or funding for enabling infrastructure. It argues that any supporting facilities such as childcare, local shops, or community uses should be treated as essential infrastructure and delivered in tandem with housing, rather than as optional or deferred elements. The core position is that NW3 should not be rezoned unless and until necessary infrastructure is clearly committed, funded, and delivered or secured through binding phasing conditions, to avoid further strain on an already under-resourced area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Howard</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	--------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission highlights serious concerns about the scale of housing development in Kerry Pike since 2019, which has occurred without corresponding investment in infrastructure or utilities. Pedestrian safety is a major issue, with unsafe and incomplete footpaths through the village preventing residents from walking safely in either direction. Traffic levels during peak morning and evening periods are described as unsafe due to an inadequate road network, compounded by the absence of any public bus service. In addition, recurring water outages caused by an aging pipe network point to significant deficiencies in utility infrastructure. The central concern is that road safety, pedestrian access, public transport, and utility capacity have not been addressed despite substantial population growth, and that urgent investment is required to make the area safe and functional for existing residents.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mark Phelan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission, made by a long-term local resident, supports the need for housing but objects to the proposed rezoning at Kerry Pike on the basis that essential infrastructure has not kept pace with recent development. Key concerns include inadequate water and electricity supply, poor road infrastructure, lack of public lighting, insufficient pedestrian safety measures, and a shortage of local services such as public transport, shops, childcare, and school capacity. It is argued that these issues are critical for the future of the community and must be addressed before any further housing expansion is permitted.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ian O’Sullivan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Millboro, Kerry Pike, stating that the village’s infrastructure is already inadequate. Concerns include frequent water and electricity outages, poor road conditions, lack of footpaths and pedestrian safety, absence of public transport, and limited local services. It is argued that Kerry Pike cannot accommodate further housing development until essential infrastructure upgrades are delivered, and the rezoning should therefore be refused.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ester Kelleher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission opposes the proposed rezoning of land behind Millboro in Kerry Pike, highlighting the traffic congestion; lack of road and transport infrastructure; and the dangerous roads given the level of traffic.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Aoife McCarthy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield and Hazelwood Estate in Glanmire. As a local resident, they believe the proposal fails to consider existing community conditions, including already high housing density and traffic levels. Key concerns are:</p> <p>Traffic congestion: The local road network is already under strain, particularly during school times, with increased risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and residents. Additional housing would worsen congestion and safety issues.</p>			

Environmental impact: Rezoning would result in the loss of greenfield land, negatively affecting biodiversity, local amenities, and the character of the area.

Pressure on infrastructure: Access through existing estates would overburden narrow roads and insufficient pedestrian facilities, creating further safety concerns.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Erika Mackey</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission strongly opposes the proposed rezoning of Kerry Pike for additional housing. It highlights severe traffic congestion, particularly at peak times, and states that the existing road network lacks the capacity to accommodate further development. Concerns are also raised about insufficient infrastructure, including the lack of footpaths, pedestrian safety measures, and the absence of reliable public transport or bus stop facilities. Overall, it is argued that Kerry Pike cannot support additional large-scale housing development in its current condition.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Markus Meisl</b>
-----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission from a local resident of the Togher/Lehenaghmore area, formally objects to aspects of the proposed rezoning for residential development in the area. While not opposed to housing in principle, the submission strongly opposes the current proposal due to its scale, density, and proximity to existing homes, which they believe would harm residential amenity, privacy, and the established character of the area. The issues raised include inadequate infrastructure: Existing pressure on roads, schools, childcare, healthcare, public transport, and recreational facilities would be worsened by significant population growth. Lack of supporting assessments: There is insufficient evidence that critical infrastructure, transport, education, healthcare, drainage, and utilities, can support the development. Inconsistent planning standards: The proposal appears to allow impacts (e.g., overlooking, proximity issues) that have previously led to refusals for private applicants. Community and social concerns: The submission raises doubts about whether housing allocations will benefit local families, along with fears that increased density without adequate youth services and policing could worsen existing anti-social behaviour. Impact on neighbourhood character: The scale of development risks undermining a stable, established residential area where homeowners have made long-term investments. Premature development and lack of phasing: The proposal appears infrastructure-following rather than infrastructure-led, raising sustainability concerns. The submission calls for a more evidence-based, phased approach, with strict conditions tying development to the delivery of essential infrastructure before occupation of housing units.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ahmed Mohamed</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the grounds that existing development has already placed excessive pressure on local infrastructure. It highlights inadequate road capacity, frequent traffic congestion, poor visibility, and serious pedestrian safety concerns due to the absence of continuous footpaths.</p> <p>Further concerns include the lack of public transport, unreliable water and electricity services, poor road conditions, and very limited local amenities, including no shop safely accessible on foot. The submission concludes that Kerry Pike cannot accommodate further large-scale residential development until traffic management, infrastructure, utilities, and pedestrian safety improvements are delivered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Susan Wright</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission raises serious concerns about the proposed rezoning (NE 1) and its potential impact on the local area, infrastructure, and residents’ quality of life. The submission highlights existing issues with traffic congestion and road safety, noting that the roads surrounding Glashaboy Heights and neighbouring estates are already heavily congested and this would be exacerbated and made less safe by further development. In addition, the road network lacks the capacity to support additional residential development without significant upgrades.</p> <p>The submission contends that the nearby motorway already contributes to noise and air pollution in the area, which would be exacerbated by increased housing and vehicle use, thereby negatively affecting residents’ health and wellbeing. Additionally, the rezoning would result in the loss of valuable greenfield land that currently serves as a buffer, supports biodiversity, and provides natural amenity space. Its loss would permanently alter the character of the area.</p> <p>Given existing pressures on infrastructure and public services, the submission argues that development should only proceed where adequate infrastructure and services are already in place or guaranteed in advance.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eoin Barrett</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further residential rezoning in the Lehenaghmore area on the grounds that existing infrastructure is not fit for purpose. While recent footpath works are acknowledged, it is stated that road capacity remains inadequate and unable to accommodate current traffic levels, let alone the potential addition of approximately 700 dwellings and increased vehicular movements.</p> <p>The submission highlights the long-standing absence of promised local amenities, including shops, a crèche, parks, and community facilities, noting that such services were indicated</p>			

many years ago and have yet to materialise. Concerns are also raised regarding worsening traffic congestion, unreliable bus services, and the resulting impact on daily commuting and quality of life.

Overall, the submission contends that the lack of coordinated infrastructure and amenities reflects poor planning and requests that Cork City Council address existing deficits before permitting further residential development in the area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	101	From:	Paul O’Regan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission accepts the need for housing but objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike, stating that housing growth has far exceeded infrastructure provision. Concerns include inadequate roads, lack of public and active transport, absence of continuous footpaths, unreliable water and electricity supply, insufficient childcare and community facilities, and limited public amenities. It is argued that further residential rezoning should not proceed until services, connectivity, and infrastructure are upgraded and the character of the village is protected.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	102	From:	Dermot Sheedy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission comments on the proposed rezoning at Kerry Pike, acknowledging the need for housing but expressing concern that infrastructure and services promised under previous developments have not been delivered. It highlights unsafe and accident-prone junctions, lack of footpaths, narrow roads, and the absence of junction controls or road widening despite significant population growth. It is noted that Bus Éireann has been unable to provide bus stops due to inadequate road width. The submission concludes that roads, infrastructure, and services should be improved first, and that further development should not proceed until these issues are addressed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	103	From:	Dr Declan King (Withdrawn)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN DUE TO DUPLICATION REFER TO SUBMISSION CRK-C378-CDPV3-81			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Valerie Prodromou</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore. It refers to the cumulative impacts of extensive development and recent infrastructure works in the area, including loss of residential amenity, privacy, historic boundary features, and greenfield character.</p> <p>The submission raises concerns regarding ongoing construction disruption, limited community engagement, particularly with elderly residents, and the removal of established habitats supporting local wildlife, including bats, hedgehogs and foxes.</p> <p>It is contended that further rezoning would constitute an overdevelopment of the area and would undermine community wellbeing, and the submission requests that Sites SW1 and SW2 be omitted from the proposed variation.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mario Prodromou</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission provides a personal objection to the proposed rezoning in Lehenaghmore, emphasising the significant emotional and quality-of-life impacts already experienced by nearby residents.</p> <p>It highlights a loss of privacy and visual amenity due to existing development, ongoing dust, runoff, noise, and pollution affecting homes, sleep, and daily routines, as well as frequent water issues. Serious concern is expressed that further development will overwhelm inadequate infrastructure, increase traffic, and reduce property values.</p> <p>The submission conveys a strong sense of distress, feeling unheard and forgotten, and argues that continued development is placing an unfair and unsustainable burden on existing residents’ wellbeing and livelihoods.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kjeld van den Heuvel</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission expresses overall support for the proposed Variation, while advocating for stronger and more explicit requirements in relation to cycling and active travel infrastructure. It supports the emphasis on sustainable transport, compact growth, and transport-oriented development, and welcomes the inclusion of active travel, including walking and cycling, across key growth areas. However, it raises concern that cycling infrastructure continues to be treated as secondary to road projects, and calls for the delivery of high-quality, safe, segregated, and continuous cycling routes designed to accommodate users of all ages and abilities. The submission highlights that planned housing growth presents a significant opportunity to avoid car-dependent development patterns and instead embed sustainable mobility from the outset. It recommends that the Variation be used to strengthen active travel provisions, including the delivery of infrastructure early in the development process,</p>			

prioritisation of walking and cycling permeability, and the design of neighbourhoods around sustainable transport principles. It further emphasises the need for improved junction and crossing design to minimise cyclist–vehicle conflict, the provision of high-quality cycle parking in major residential and mixed-use schemes, and the establishment of clear delivery requirements and measurable standards for permeability and integrated travel connections in key development areas such as Ballyvolane, Ringwood, and proposed regional parks. Overall, the submission stresses the importance of reducing car dependency through compact development, proximity to services, and the consistent provision of high-quality active travel infrastructure.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 76

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sarah Hurley</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike (behind Millboro), stating that existing infrastructure is inadequate to support further development. It highlights significant daily traffic congestion, lack of public transport, and absence of footpaths, arguing that these issues must be resolved before any additional housing or increased traffic volumes can be considered.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Julie-Ann Rowan</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission opposes the rezoning of agricultural lands to residential zoned lands in the Douglas area (SE 2). While the need for housing is acknowledged, it is argued that the proposal is premature and unsupported by adequate infrastructure.

It is stated that no comprehensive infrastructure plan has been provided to address key requirements such as road capacity, drainage, water supply, public transport, and community services. It is suggested that proceeding in the absence of such provisions would place significant strain on existing systems.

Existing traffic congestion is identified as a serious issue, with rural roads already experiencing high traffic volumes, resulting in delays, safety concerns, and reduced quality of life. It is considered that additional housing would worsen these conditions if current deficiencies are not first addressed.

Concerns are also raised regarding the loss of agricultural land, which is described as important for farming, biodiversity, and the rural character of the area. It is noted that this land contributes significantly to the environmental quality and visual landscape of the community.

It is therefore urged that the rezoning proposal be reconsidered until a detailed and adequately funded infrastructure plan is established and existing traffic and service issues have been effectively resolved.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mark Prendergast</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore on the basis that existing infrastructure is insufficient to support further residential development. It highlights unsafe road access to existing estates due to poor visibility, steep road gradients, and heavy daily traffic, stating that additional housing and access points would increase congestion and accident risk.</p> <p>The submission notes that cycling infrastructure is impractical due to topography and that bus services are inadequate, resulting in continued reliance on private cars. Concerns are also raised regarding the loss of rural character and impacts on local wildlife. It is argued that housing demand should be met through the reuse of derelict properties rather than rezoning remaining greenfield lands.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ethna Murphy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission expresses concern with proposed rezoning at Lehenaghmore, highlighting the generations of her family who have lived in this area surrounded by green fields, but the past several years have seen increased housing developments. While acknowledging the need for increased housing, the submission argues that the necessary amenities have not been included in the zoning plans, i.e. roads, footpaths, shops, childcare facilities and green areas for the children to play. The submission recommends consulting local residents first, rather than creating future problems.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Donal O’Keeffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to Proposed Variation No. 3 seeking to rezone lands at Lehenaghmore (Sites SW1 and SW2) from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhood. Concerns are raised regarding inadequate road capacity, existing traffic congestion, and the absence of viable public transport, which would be exacerbated by additional development.</p> <p>The submission highlights significant flood risk associated with the loss of permeable greenfield lands, noting potential impacts on adjacent and downstream residential areas, and states that existing flood relief measures were not designed to accommodate further development. Additional concerns include construction-related noise and dust, lack of site-specific impact assessments, loss of privacy through overlooking, and adverse impacts on biodiversity due to the removal of mature trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>It is contended that the rezoning conflicts with existing Development Plan objectives and previous expectations for green space and local amenities. The submission requests that the rezoning be refused until adequate infrastructure and a comprehensive, consultative plan for the area are put in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jennifer Dineen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to proposed rezoning at Sallybrook/Riverstown and submits that the proposal does not comply with requirements set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Plan; existing streets in Hazelwood and Crestfield estates are narrow with limited pedestrian infrastructure and cannot accommodate additional the vehicular traffic that would result from new development. The additional traffic would create risks to pedestrian and child safety and undermine residential amenity in terms of noise and pollution; development of the site would compromise local biodiversity and would remove natural flood attenuation capacity. Considerable housing development has occurred in Glanmire in the past two decades, and issues arising from this development (infrastructure, congestion, environmental pressures, and lack of facilities) should be addressed before further rezoning is considered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Lynda O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concern about the proposed rezoning of two greenfield sites in Lehenaghmore, following recent and permitted developments that will deliver approximately 200 additional homes. While road upgrade works are welcomed, it is stated that they do not improve traffic flow or junction capacity and that congestion on the L2454 and L2455 is already significant. Rezoning SW1 and SW2 is considered likely to exacerbate peak-hour traffic congestion and safety risks.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised regarding the proximity of the sites to Cork Airport flight paths, with potential noise, safety, and amenity impacts for future residents, and a call for detailed assessment in this regard.</p> <p>The submission argues that Lehenaghmore does not require additional housing but instead needs community infrastructure and amenities. It suggests alternative uses for the sites, including schools, primary care, local shops, hospitality uses, a public park, playground, and sporting facilities, to serve the area’s young and growing population. Overall, the view expressed is that the lands should be reserved for community infrastructure rather than further residential development and that a broader area development plan is needed to guide sustainable growth.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Robyn Kehoe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further development in Kerry Pike due to a significant existing infrastructure deficit. It highlights increased population without corresponding investment, severe peak-time traffic congestion, inadequate road capacity, the lack of an effective BusConnects service, and continued car dependency. The submission calls for improved sustainable transport links, including new footpaths connecting to the Lee Road, and raises concerns about pressure on local school capacity. It concludes that infrastructure, transport, and education issues must be addressed before any further residential development proceeds.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jill Dalton</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed development of 500 houses at Glashaboy, Glanmire and specifically the provision of access through existing residential estates. Notes that existing residential streets are narrow and a key walking route for families and children and are unsuitable for construction and operational traffic for new houses at Glashaboy, Glanmire. Concerns include collisions, structural property damage, danger to pedestrians and children, air quality and environmental impacts, and noise and dust pollution. Cites previous experience / concerns with the speed and safety of construction traffic in the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Vicente Giliberti</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to proposed rezoning of the farm lands above the Crestfield residential estate, with the primary concern being traffic impact on existing Crestfield and Hazelwood estates and the safety risks to children and pedestrians. Proposes that any future development should include an independent access route.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rory Bickerstaffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to rezoning of land for development in the vicinity of the Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates based on negative impacts on the safety and wellbeing of the existing residents. Specific issues noted include the stated unsuitability of the existing street design for additional traffic volumes, the volume of traffic that would result from new development, and potential safety risks to children given the two green areas along the route. Proposes that an alternative route for proposed development should be identified.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Mylod</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to any further rezoning of the Farm Lands above Crestfield Estate owing to the future increase in noise pollution and the number of Vehicles which would use the estate.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Hansie Treasa Lucey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed re-zoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the grounds that the village’s infrastructure and services have not kept pace with recent population growth.</p> <p>Key concerns raised include the absence of any public transport serving Kerry Pike, recurrent interruptions to essential services such as water supply and electricity, and poor road conditions. The lack of footpaths is highlighted as a significant safety and accessibility issue, particularly the absence of a continuous footpath linking the west and east of the village.</p> <p>The submission also notes that there is no local shop within walking distance and no footpath infrastructure to safely access services outside the immediate area.</p> <p>Overall, it is contended that Kerry Pike cannot accommodate further residential development at this time, and that no additional housing should be permitted until critical deficiencies in infrastructure, traffic management, facilities, and services are urgently addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Evelyn Stapleton</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to proposed zoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire and specifically to the routing of traffic from new development through existing estate. Specifically notes the existing narrow roads, challenging current conditions with existing levels of traffic including queues to access main Hazelwood Road, safety risks to children (especially playing on the green and walking to school), noise pollution, and stress induced by these impacts.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Claire Duggan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore under Variation No. 3, citing serious and unresolved concerns. While the submitter no longer resides directly adjacent to the lands, close family members do, and the rezoning is considered to pose a direct risk to their homes. The principal concern is flooding, with detailed historical evidence of surface water flowing from the subject lands toward neighbouring properties, including past garden damage and internal flooding. The submitter states that no adequate flood risk or drainage assessments have been published despite the site’s known hydrological issues and potential downstream impacts.			
Additional concerns include severe pressures on an already constrained road network, lack of public transport, and absence of local services such as healthcare, schools, childcare, and shops. The site’s location under the Cork Airport flight path and within the Airport Public Safety Zone is highlighted, with no accompanying noise or aviation safety assessments provided. The submission also raises procedural concerns about apparent pre-emptive site access works.			
Finally, the ecological value of the lands is emphasised, noting the presence of protected and locally important wildlife dependent on existing hedgerows and open fields. Overall, the submission urges the removal of these lands from Variation No. 3 due to flooding risk, infrastructure inadequacy, missing assessments, and environmental sensitivity.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sinead McDonnell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of c11.4 hectares at Lehenaghmore (SW1) for residential development, arguing that it is not aligned with a plan-led and infrastructure-led approach to development, and therefore the rezoning is premature and represents unsustainable planning that runs contrary to the National Planning Framework (NPF) and local ecological, transport, and public health policies.			

The submission contends that there is no evidence the land meets the NPF’s “Tiered Approach” requirements (that the land be either “fully serviced” or “serviceable within the plan period”), and that prioritising this greenfield site represents inappropriate leapfrog development.

It raises concerns about reliance on flawed, COVID-era noise data and highlights potentially significant aircraft noise impacts, particularly in light of planned Cork Airport expansion to 5 million passengers p.a., calling for a site-specific acoustic assessment.

The submission identifies a serious flood risk, noting that development would replace permeable soil with impermeable hardstanding, and thereby increase runoff into an already constrained culvert system (sections of the Togher culvert operate with a safety margin of as little as 0.2m), potentially reintroducing historical flooding issues in the downstream Togher area.

It also argues that development is premature pending completion and independent audit of the Lehenaghmore Road Improvement Scheme, and questions whether there has been a case of “pre-determination” due to apparent site access works before this statutory consultation has concluded.

Further objections relate to the area’s topography and active travel limitations, noting that the significant gradients characterising the Lehenaghmore plateau limit the uptake of cycling, and the “pinch points” along Togher Road make continuous segregated active travel corridors unfeasible.

The submission points to a lack of essential social infrastructure in the area such as healthcare, schools, and community amenities, and contends that rezoning is premature until a social infrastructure audit is conducted.

The submission states that the area has already absorbed significant residential growth without adequate supporting services, and that approving high-density housing without a commercial/community “heart” risks creating a car-dependent monocultural dormitory zone.

Ecological concerns are raised regarding protected species and habitats in the site, with the submission asserting that rezoning should not proceed without a comprehensive ecological impact assessment. It also highlights potential negative impacts from redevelopment on landscape character, particularly the protection of the visual amenity of the city’s southern ridge line.

The submission concludes that the proposed rezoning SW1 is fundamentally flawed and should be removed from Proposed Variation No. 3. Without prejudice to this, if zoning proceeds, it sets out a series of stringent conditions that should be applied, including infrastructure delivery requirements, strict hydrological controls, transport infrastructure prerequisites, mandatory technical assessments, ecological protections, and limits on building density and height. Finally, it questions the absence of geotechnical and soil permeability data from the consultation, arguing that this undermines transparency and prevents proper assessment of flood risk.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	123	From:	David Good
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of c11.4 hectares at Lehenaghmore (SW1) for residential development, arguing that it is not aligned with a plan-led and infrastructure-led approach to development, and therefore the rezoning is premature and represents unsustainable planning that runs contrary to the National Planning Framework (NPF) and local ecological, transport, and public health policies.</p>			

The submission contends that there is no evidence the land meets the NPF’s “Tiered Approach” requirements (that the land be either “fully serviced” or “serviceable within the plan period”), and that prioritising this greenfield site represents inappropriate leapfrog development.

It raises concerns about reliance on flawed, COVID-era noise data and highlights potentially significant aircraft noise impacts, particularly in light of planned Cork Airport expansion to 5 million passengers p.a., calling for a site-specific acoustic assessment.

The submission identifies a serious flood risk, noting that development would replace permeable soil with impermeable hardstanding, and thereby increase runoff into an already constrained culvert system (sections of the Togher culvert operate with a safety margin of as little as 0.2m), potentially reintroducing historical flooding issues in the downstream Togher area.

It also argues that development is premature pending completion and independent audit of the Lehenaghmore Road Improvement Scheme, and questions whether there has been a case of “pre-determination” due to apparent site access works before this statutory consultation has concluded.

Further objections relate to the area’s topography and active travel limitations, noting that the significant gradients characterising the Lehenaghmore plateau limit the uptake of cycling, and the “pinch points” along Togher Road make continuous segregated active travel corridors unfeasible.

The submission points to a lack of essential social infrastructure in the area such as healthcare, schools, and community amenities, and contends that rezoning is premature until a social infrastructure audit is conducted.

The submission states that the area has already absorbed significant residential growth without adequate supporting services, and that approving high-density housing without a commercial/community “heart” risks creating a car-dependent monocultural dormitory zone.

Ecological concerns are raised regarding protected species and habitats in the site, with the submission asserting that rezoning should not proceed without a comprehensive ecological impact assessment. It also highlights potential negative impacts from redevelopment on landscape character, particularly the protection of the visual amenity of the city’s southern ridge line.

The submission concludes that the proposed rezoning SW1 is fundamentally flawed and should be removed from Proposed Variation No. 3. Without prejudice to this, if zoning proceeds, it sets out a series of stringent conditions that should be applied, including infrastructure delivery requirements, strict hydrological controls, transport infrastructure prerequisites, mandatory technical assessments, ecological protections, and limits on building density and height. Finally, it questions the absence of geotechnical and soil permeability data from the consultation, arguing that this undermines transparency and prevents proper assessment of flood risk.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	124	From:	Niamh O’Shea
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to further rezoning or large-scale residential development in the Kerry Pike area due to existing infrastructure and service deficiencies. It highlights severe traffic congestion, particularly when exiting Millboro and Clonlara estates and accessing the Lee Road and Healy’s Bridge during peak hours, and states that the road network is already unsafe and overburdened. Additional development is considered likely to significantly worsen these conditions.</p>			

The submission also notes a lack of essential local services and infrastructure, including poor and unreliable public transport that leaves residents heavily dependent on private cars. Concerns are raised about increasing antisocial behaviour, such as loitering and car break-ins, which are linked to the absence of adequate recreational and social amenities for young people. The core position is that no further rezoning should be permitted until transport, infrastructure, and local services are substantially improved.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	125	From:	Mark Twomey
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (SW1). While recognising the need for additional housing, the submitter argues that the rezoning is premature, unsustainable, and contrary to national and local planning policy due to the absence of supporting infrastructure, services, and evidence-based assessments.</p> <p>Key concerns include a severe deficit in social infrastructure, with no local GP, pharmacy, school, childcare facilities, playgrounds, shops, or community amenities, placing particular pressure on families with additional healthcare and therapy needs. Dependence on distant services is exacerbated by chronic traffic congestion, lack of public transport, unsafe road conditions, and limited active travel options, resulting in long delays for essential journeys.</p> <p>The submission raises multiple technical objections, including failure to demonstrate compliance with the National Planning Framework’s tiered approach to zoning, unresolved flooding and downstream hydrological risks to Toghher flood defences, and inadequate assessment of traffic capacity pending completion of the Lehenaghmore Road Improvement Scheme. Concerns are also expressed regarding aircraft noise and safety due to the site’s proximity to Cork Airport, reliance on unrepresentative COVID-era noise data, and potential future airport expansion.</p> <p>Environmental and heritage impacts are highlighted, including the loss of protected wildlife habitats, ecological corridors, mature hedgerows, stone walls, and visual harm to the southern ridgeline landscape. The submitter also cites a lack of public confidence in the planning process due to repeated failures to deliver promised amenities.</p> <p>The primary request is that the proposed residential rezoning be removed or deferred. Should rezoning proceed, the submission calls for strict site-specific conditions, including delivery of social infrastructure prior to occupation, completion and audit of transport works, robust flood, traffic, ecological and noise assessments, protection of heritage and landscape features, and strict limits on density and building height.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cait O’Shea</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to development of lands above Crestfield, including the proposed access via existing residential estates. Reasons cited are significant alteration of established character and residential amenity of existing estate, insufficiency of existing street network design to take increased traffic volumes, impacts on child safety, impacts on privacy, impacts on existing amenity space, impacts during construction phase (including HGV traffic, noise, dust/air quality impacts, and disturbance over an extended period), and impact on property value. Objects to a proposed one-way system citing reasons of inconvenience and unfair burden on existing residents. Proposes alternative access arrangements that do not impact existing cul de sacs and existing street infrastructure.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Barry Finn</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for housing in Cork City however objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conflict with the sequential approach to development: The submission raises concerns regarding the rezoning of the site in relation to local and national policy objectives which prioritise compact growth within established urban areas before greenfield and edge-of-city expansion. The submitter outlines there has been no evidence to suggest these preferable sites have been exhausted.</li> <li>2. Lack of an integrated Local Area Plan or Masterplan Framework: The submitter raises concerns of a lack of Local Area Plan or Framework for the site which could create a precedent for piecemeal, uncoordinated suburban expansion, conflicting with planning policy.</li> <li>3. Cumulative impact of residential expansion in the Douglas Area: The submission expresses concern over the disproportionate residential development over the past decade and outlines concerns in relation to capacity of road networks, public transport, schools and social amenities. It is outlined that ‘Phased Development’ policies require development be phased in tandem with the delivery of enabling infrastructure and notes that no Capacity Assessment or Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been published.</li> <li>4. Conflict with Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Objectives: submitter outlines the CDPs strong commitment to green infrastructure and the protection of biodiversity. As the site forms part of a broader landscape buffer, it is submitted that rezoning this land without a detailed ecological assessment and green infrastructure strategy would conflict with obligations under the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 and the Wildlife Acts 1976-2012.</li> <li>5. Public participation and procedural concerns: The submitter outlines that the variation constitutes a material amendment to a statutory document and that residents and stakeholders should be entitled to a full and transparent assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed changes. The submitter believes the supporting documentation does not provide sufficient analysis of alternatives considered, nor the basis on which the site was selected over other sites and falls short of the standards required under National and EU planning policies.</li> </ol>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Donnacha McCarthy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike owing to ongoing infrastructure issues, highlighting that residents already experience frequent power outages, water supply problems, severe traffic congestion, and poor public transport. Existing infrastructure is not capable of supporting additional development, and further rezoning would place even greater pressure on already overstretched local services.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Graham O’Shea</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to elements of the Proposed Variation, particularly the proposed rezoning of additional land for residential development. While acknowledging the need for more housing in Cork, they argue that the scale and speed of rezoning are not being matched by adequate infrastructure and services. Key concerns include insufficient capacity in roads, public transport, schools, healthcare, drainage, and community facilities to support the proposed growth.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Sallybrook, Glanmire, increased pressure on an already large nearby residential estate, without clear plans for necessary upgrades.</li> <li>• Traffic and safety risks, especially if new development routes vehicles through existing estate roads not designed for heavy use. The resulting increase in traffic and congestion would significantly impact the safety, character, and “home zone” feel of the existing Glashaboy community.</li> <li>• Potential environmental impacts, including loss of undeveloped land, biodiversity, and changes to local character.</li> <li>• Lack of transparency and evidence supporting the extent of rezoning and how infrastructure will be delivered.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Lisa O’Shea</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission acknowledges the need for additional housing in Cork City but objects to aspects of Proposed Variation due to concerns about impacts on existing communities and infrastructure.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Sallybrook, Glanmire, key concerns include increased pressure on already strained local infrastructure, including roads, drainage, schools, healthcare, and amenities.</li> <li>• The proposed development expanding from an existing large estate, intensifying these pressures.</li> <li>• Traffic from the new development likely using existing estate roads, which are not designed for high volumes, creating safety risks and affecting the residential character of Glashaboy.</li> </ul>			

- Lack of sufficient detail on traffic management, infrastructure upgrades, and environmental impacts.

The submission contends development should only proceed with proper planning and infrastructure support, and asks Cork City Council to reconsider the rezoning with a more sustainable, well-supported approach.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	131	From:	Frank O’Connell
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of agricultural land on the Clogheen side of Millboro, Kerry Pike, citing fundamental planning, infrastructure, and safety concerns. It argues that the lands lie on or near a long-standing proposed route for the original Cork North Ring Road, and that rezoning could prejudice future strategic transport delivery. The submission also states that further housing would be contrary to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which limits Kerry Pike’s growth due to known deficiencies in water, roads, and services, deficiencies that have not been addressed despite housing growth already far exceeding recommended levels.</p> <p>Severe road safety risks are a central concern, with narrow or missing footpaths, speeding traffic, heavy goods vehicles, and unsafe conditions for children walking to school. Traffic congestion is described as extreme, with Kerry Pike now functioning as a major through-route rather than a village street. Utilities are reported as unreliable, with frequent water leaks, outages, and power interruptions. The lack of adequate public transport, local childcare, shops, and other essential services is also highlighted, alongside a pattern of approved community facilities being replaced by additional housing. The core position is that rezoning for more housing without first delivering infrastructure, services, traffic calming, and safety measures is unsafe, unsustainable, and contrary to proper planning principles.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	132	From:	Alex Duggan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore under Variation No. 3 to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028. The submitter, a long-term resident, raises concerns that the lands are currently designated as green/open space and part of the city’s green belt, and that rezoning would conflict with existing Development Plan objectives.</p> <p>Key issues highlighted include potential negative impacts on wildlife and habitats, increased flood risk due to known drainage and surface water issues, traffic congestion and insufficient infrastructure, and the site’s location within the Outer Public Safety Zone of Cork Airport, with associated noise and safety implications. The submission also notes a lack of publicly available studies or assessments to justify the rezoning.</p> <p>The submitter requests that the rezoning be withdrawn or deferred until full environmental, flooding, traffic, and airport-related assessments are completed. If development proceeds, they seek safeguards including early delivery of childcare and public open space, detailed traffic and noise assessments, and low-density, two-storey housing to protect existing</p>			

residential amenity. The submitter remains open to further engagement with Cork City Council on this matter.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	133	From:	Patricia Mohally
----------------	-----	-------	------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission from a resident of Lehenaghmore highlighting a number of infrastructure and amenity improvements that need to be completed before further development in the area. Submission notes that there is no local shop, GP, or dentist, and neither is there a creche, local school or playground despite the number of children in the area. The road improvement scheme is welcomed but when complete will already be over capacity. A new access road to the Bandon Road or the Airport Road would be required, as would bus lanes, a detailed traffic plan, and more infrastructure to accompany all the proposed building.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	134	From:	James Daly
----------------	-----	-------	------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in the Lehenaghmore area, stating that the area has been poorly planned over the past 25 years and lacks essential services and facilities despite a large and growing population. It is noted that residents are entirely car-dependent due to the absence of nearby schools, healthcare, shops, childcare, or recreational facilities.

The submission raises concerns regarding inadequate road infrastructure and traffic capacity, arguing that local roads are not fit for purpose and cannot accommodate additional vehicular traffic arising from further residential development. It requests that no additional rezoning proceed until current road works and existing developments are completed.

The submission further states that any new zoned lands should provide for community uses such as playgrounds, schools, shops, or crèches, and suggests that housing growth should instead be directed towards higher-density, infrastructure-served locations such as brownfield or docklands sites, rather than extending urban sprawl into areas lacking supporting infrastructure.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Douglas &amp; St Fin Barre’s Scout Group</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission acknowledges the need for more housing in the area, but raises concerns that the housing plans don't accommodate the needs of the community, such as parks and amenities. Highlights that Douglas Scouts, a group with 150 youth members, urgently need a proper scout hall with adjoining green space, and notes that these rezoning plans should incorporate that.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 73			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin O’Regan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to the proposed development of c.500 houses in Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1) owing to the serious negative impact it will have on existing residents and the local environment. The primary concern expressed is the significant increase in traffic that this development will generate, which the narrow, heavily-used roads are not designed to safely accommodate. The increased traffic would raise major safety concerns for existing residents, particularly children, families and pedestrians. The submission expresses concern that during previous building projects in the area, residents suffered from excessive dust, dirt, and poor air quality over extended periods, which affected the children (who needed inhalers) and the family (which was unable to open windows or use the garden for extended periods). The submission is concerned that new development would affect local families' health and wellbeing. In addition, the strain this development will place on local infrastructure, road capacity and the overall quality of life for existing residents has not been adequately addressed. Submission notes many residents moved into the area understanding that the surrounding green space and character would be preserved. Developing this land would permanently alter the nature of the area and result in the loss of valuable open space and environmental amenity for the community.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sinead Egan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas. The submission considers the rezoning premature, noting there are existing underutilised zoned lands, there is a lack of evidence that infrastructure can support the development, as well as unassessed cumulative impacts from other developments in the area.			
It is considered that the rezoning would contradict compact growth policy to prioritise brownfield and infill development and drive further urban sprawl.			
A concern is also raised that rezoning the site will have an environmental impact, lead to a loss of remaining greenbelt functions, impact biodiversity drainage and visual amenity values and lacks a clear mitigation strategy.			

It is submitted that the area experiences flooding issues and that major development would increase runoff and pressure on drainage infrastructure.

The submission considers the proposal contrary to RSES guidance, and not part of a wider strategic plan, risking piecemeal and opportunistic development.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	138	From:	Barry O’Hanlon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission expresses concern that proposed development is to be accessed through the Crestfield and Hazelwood estates, highlighting safety risks to residents and children owing to increased traffic and congestion. Submission notes that rural living means reliance on cars for daily activities. There is also concern about the loss of green spaces and a lack of improved local amenities over many years. Instead of more development, there is a call for investment in community spaces like parks. Overall, there is worry that Glanmire’s character as a village is being lost due to overdevelopment.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	139	From:	Paul Canning
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE1 on a number of grounds. Access to the new site should not be facilitated through Crestfield/Hazelwood as it can't take the additional traffic. Existing road network in Crestfield Downs is narrow and reduced further by parked cars. Increased traffic through the estate would be a safety hazard, particularly for children. The development would negatively impact residents’ quality of life owing to increased noise, dust, and parking. In addition, access and egress through the T-junction to the estate would be dangerous; the road is already at capacity, and the bicycle lanes further impede safety. Rezoning would place further pressure on services. The submission suggests providing access elsewhere so as not to exacerbate an already stretched travel network.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	140	From:	Denis McSweeney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed development of approximately 90 additional housing units at Millboro, Kerry Pike, citing significant deficiencies in local infrastructure and services. It highlights frequent water outages due to an inadequate and outdated water pipe network, as well as regular electricity supply disruptions. Serious concerns are raised regarding traffic volumes and speeding through the village, combined with poor road conditions.			

The submission emphasises the lack of pedestrian safety infrastructure, noting the absence of footpaths, safe crossing points, and traffic calming measures, which prevents adults and children from safely walking to school and through the village.

Further concerns relate to the complete absence of a bus service serving Kerry Pike, Clogheen, and Woodside. The submission states that the failure to provide public transport has left the community underserved and that such a service is critical to the area.

Finally, it is argued that the proposed development could compromise the Government’s plans for the North Ring Road. Overall, the submission concludes that the development should not be permitted to proceed until essential infrastructure and transport issues are adequately addressed.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	141	From:	Nora McSweeney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed development of 90 housing units at Millboro, Kerry Pike, stating that essential infrastructure has not been provided. Concerns include the absence of footpaths throughout the village, creating unsafe access to community facilities such as the GAA pitch, school, playground, and tennis club. The submission also highlights excessive traffic speeds, lack of traffic calming, pedestrian crossings, and adequate street lighting, as well as frequent water and electricity outages. The absence of a local bus service is emphasised, particularly its impact on older residents, with the view that further housing should not proceed until infrastructure and services are properly delivered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	142	From:	Chris Mansfield
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges that SSO1 at Moneygourney, Douglas will be developed in the future and recognises the need for housing growth, however opposition is expressed to rezone the site at this time. The proposal is considered premature and in need of a masterplan, with grounds for objection summarised as follows:</p> <p>Heritage: the site occupies historically significant ground associated with the Battle of Douglas/Rochestown (August 1922). The submission claims that no heritage impact assessment has been undertaken, and no reference to this significance has been included.</p> <p>Landscape: Reference is made to the site being located on an elevated ridge, where development is generally discouraged under the Cork City Development Plan.</p> <p>Community Facilities and Car Dependency: there is a significant deficit in community facilities in the area and car travel is required to access essential services, including to the secondary schools in Douglas. The submission considers that high car dependency is evidenced by Census 2022 data, with minimal public transport usage recorded, and that a traffic assessment is needed to consider the nature of local trips and the anticipated traffic from all extant permissions. It is further argued that additional anticipated road capacity from</p>			

the M28 should be assessed after the road is operational, as experience has shown that additional capacity induces demand and generates additional traffic.

**Public Transport:** Existing bus services are described as operating beyond capacity, and it is stated that proposed Bus Connects plans indicate a reduction in service frequency. It is submitted that the major employment destinations have no direct connection from Moneygourney, causing car dependency for employment journeys. It is requested that the impact of the proposal be reviewed regarding the deliverability and performance of BusConnects Corridor 1.

**Premature Decision and Lack of Evidence:** It is stated that key assessments, including services demand audits, traffic modelling, heritage and landscape evaluations, and transport authority input, have not been undertaken. The potential impact of the M28 motorway remains unknown, and it is suggested that a decision should be deferred pending further evidence.

**Site Selection:** It is argued that the selection of this site is not required to meet housing targets, and that alternative, better-located sites closer to the city centre, including those with rail access, are available.

**Counter Proposal:** The submission proposes a revised approach to the development of the Moneygourney site asserting to balance housing delivery with critical infrastructure, heritage protection, and long-term public amenity.

**Southern Lands as a Regional Park:** It is proposed that 5-6 hectares of the elevated southern portion of the site be removed from residential zoning and designated as public open space. This would complete and connect three important existing assets, namely Garryduff/Old Court Woods (a 26-hectare recreation woodland), All Saints Cemetery, Carr’s Hill (a nationally significant Famine burial ground) and the Moneygourney ridge (a Civil War battlefield landscape). Together, these would form a 35-40 hectare regional park, providing open recreational space, heritage interpretation, and a continuous pedestrian route linking key historical sites while protecting the skyline landscape.

**Cross-Site Road to Address Traffic:** It is submitted that any residential development on the northern portion of the site should include a new road link between Maryborough Hill and Moneygourney Road, delivered before first occupation. This would reduce congestion at the Broadale roundabout, improve school traffic distribution, and support bus reliability.

**Development Phasing Linked to Infrastructure:** It is submitted that housing delivery should be phased and dependent on the completion of the road link, delivery of safe walking and cycling infrastructure, availability of primary school places and demonstrated traffic capacity following the opening of the M28.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Adrian Fitzgerald</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the basis that infrastructure and services have not kept pace with recent housing growth. It highlights unsafe road and pedestrian conditions, with speeding traffic placing pedestrians at risk, alongside ongoing deficiencies in utilities evidenced by regular power and water outages. The absence of essential services and amenities, particularly public transport, is also noted. The submission concludes that the rezoning should not proceed until critical infrastructure and service needs are prioritised and delivered in advance of any further development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michael Burkley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission from a resident of Hazelwood objecting strongly to the proposed Sallybrook development. The submission raises traffic and road capacity issues; the Hazelwood estate roads were originally designed for c.200 homes and are not wide enough to handle the significant increase in traffic expected from the new development. The junction at Hazelwood Hill is already congested, and additional traffic would lead to more congestion and create safety risks. The increased traffic would also make it dangerous for children accessing the estate’s central green area, which is regularly used for play and recreation. The submission highlights inadequate local infrastructure, including a shortage of schools, playing fields and recreational facilities. The submission questions why land that was previously refused planning permission has now been identified as suitable for development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Derry McCarthy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further housing development in Kerry Pike Village, citing that six new housing estates in recent years have already placed excessive pressure on the area. It highlights severe traffic congestion, with the village frequently gridlocked in the mornings and used as a rat run for commuters, leading to speeding traffic and serious safety risks due to narrow pavements and limited traffic calming. Concerns are also raised about dangerous road conditions, particularly towards Healy’s Bridge, lack of public transport and supporting infrastructure, insufficient school capacity, and frequent water and electricity outages. The submission concludes that the village cannot sustain an additional large housing estate and associated traffic at this time.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Gerard Barter</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas, and requests that a full community engagement process is undertaken ahead of any plan to rezone the area to ensure there is adequate consideration given to the necessary supporting infrastructure, drainage, safe access, traffic management and recreational facilities. Consideration of a Regional Park for the wider Douglas community would be supported.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Anita Melvin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE1) from ZO17 (Landscape Preservation) to ZO2 (New Residential Neighbourhood). The existing road network in Hazelwood and Crestfield is already operating at capacity and is not suitable for additional traffic. The increase in development would significantly worsen congestion, particularly around Hazelwood Shopping Centre, where traffic is already heavily backed up. Additional traffic would increase risks to pedestrians, especially children, while also contributing to higher noise levels, pollution, and fuel consumption due to prolonged delays and congestion. There has been a lack of strategic infrastructure investment in the area and the Cork City Development Plan (2022–2028) already acknowledges the need for major infrastructure improvements in Glanmire, including a new road bridge. Proposing additional rezoning without first delivering these upgrades would exacerbate existing bottlenecks. While housing demand is recognised, the submission argues that necessary transport infrastructure must be implemented before additional rezoning. Proceeding without this would negatively impact existing communities and the environment.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Des O’Sullivan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:			
The submitter has drainage and flooding concerns and notes that his and other properties on Moneygourney Road are regularly flooded due to inadequate drainage which has increased following the Foxwarren development. It is submitted that drainage upgrades and infrastructure led planning are important for existing and future residents.			
A concern is outlined that the local road network is suffering from congestion and peak times and is not designed to accommodate the proposed growth Concerns are also raised in relation to the impact of the new development onto public transport services and pedestrian and cyclist safety.			
In relation to community infrastructure, it is submitted that the wider area is already experiencing pressure on schools, childcare facilities, recreational amenities, healthcare			

services and community facilities and any substantial increase in population should only occur alongside proper investment in these services.

A further concern relates to the loss of greenbelt land, and the impact of continued development is having on biodiversity and wildlife habitats in the area. The submitter notes they have noticed a greater displacement of wildlife due to ongoing development nearby and future planning should seek to protect green spaces and biodiversity.

Finally, it is stated that current planning policies would potentially accommodate 400-560 homes, 1000-1,450 residents and up to 435 children. The submitter believes this would represent a very significant increase for an area where services and infrastructure are already under strain.

It is outlined that there is not opposition to the development in principle, but that growth must be properly planned and sustainable and in their view infrastructure and services should be delivered first not after housing thus benefitting both existing and future residents. The submitter urges Councillors to vote against the proposed rezoning.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	149	From:	Bellmount Developments
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the rezoning of land designated as “Site A” in the submission, from “ZO 3 – Long-Term Strategic Regeneration” to “ZO 2 – New Residential Neighbourhoods”. The site is a 4.8-hectare parcel located south of Rathcooney Road in Ballyvolane, designated as long-term strategic regeneration land (ZO 3). It sits in a key strategic location, about 3 km northeast of Cork City Centre and under 1 km from the Northern Ring Road, within an established suburban area. The site benefits from proximity to Ballyvolane District Centre and access to a wide range of services and amenities (retail, schools, recreation, community facilities). The site adjoins existing housing to the south and west and new developments to the northwest, along with nearby recreational facilities like Blarney Wood and Mayfield Sports Complex. It is well served by public transport (Bus routes 207, 208, 245A), with future improvements planned under BusConnects and CMATS. The site forms part of a larger coordinated landholding, with integrated planning intended to ensure coherent development, efficient infrastructure, and phased growth in line with Ballyvolane’s role as a key expansion area for Cork City.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 28			

Submission No.	150	From:	Barry Smith
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning in Moneygourney (SE 2), arguing that the existing level of development has already placed unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, which any additional development would exacerbate. The area is described as an important greenbelt that supports substantial biodiversity, which should be preserved for future generations. The submission states that planning authorities for moving too quickly with the proposal, with insufficient consideration of the long-term environmental damage. They urge planners to take a more sustainable and environmentally responsible approach.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eamon Goggin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission, from a long-term resident of Kerry Pike, objects to any further rezoning or development at Millboro, Kerry Pike, noting a fivefold increase in housing in the area since 1981 without corresponding improvements in infrastructure or services. It highlights that existing water, sewage, school capacity, and road networks are already overstretched, resulting in frequent water outages, severe traffic congestion, and safety risks from speeding traffic and lack of traffic calming. The submission raises serious concerns about the absence of safe pedestrian infrastructure, which leaves children and residents unable to walk safely through the village, and notes that traffic from nearby expanding villages further compounds pressures. It concludes that no further development should occur until major upgrades are delivered, including pedestrian access, traffic management, a bus service, improved utilities, childcare facilities, and increased school capacity.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Bellmount Developments</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission concerns a 6.8-hectare site (designated as Site B in the submission) in the Ballyvolane Strategic Growth Area and supports rezoning it to “ZO 2 – New Residential Neighbourhoods”. The site is located about 3 km from the city centre and close to key transport infrastructure, including the Northern Ring Road. The surrounding area is undergoing significant residential growth, supported by nearby services at Ballyvolane District Centre, though the area is currently car-dependent with limited pedestrian connectivity. The development of the lands offers an opportunity to create a sustainable residential neighbourhood, with improved walking, cycling, public realm, and active travel infrastructure. The site is already served by bus routes with further improvements planned under BusConnects, CMATS, and the proposed Cork Northern Distributor Road (CNDR). The land is currently open pasture with natural boundaries and suitable for development. The developer supports a planned, coordinated approach, including the Council’s proposed Framework Plan, to ensure delivery of housing alongside essential infrastructure and community services. While focused on Site B, the proposal emphasises a wider coordinated land strategy to deliver integrated, high-quality development across the Ballyvolane growth area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 28			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eoin O’Mahony</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1) with concerns about the scale, impact and suitability of the proposed rezoning. Concerns are highlighted as follows: The new proposal would increase traffic in the estate with inadequate infrastructure. The current estate is not yet finished (road surfaces unfinished, no disability access on various footpaths). Any increase in traffic could affect road safety for residents, pedestrians, cyclists and schoolchildren. The new proposal would increase noise pollution,</p>			

dust, and air pollution in the area. Existing Infrastructure such as roads, public transport, drainage, healthcare and schools could not cope with an additional residential development of this size.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michael O’Leary</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission reiterates previously expressed concerns of local residents in objecting to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike for housing development. It asserts that no further zoning or development should be permitted until essential infrastructure is in place to support the existing and growing population, including adequate public transport, traffic management, school and pre-school capacity, and reliable water and electricity services. The submission further argues that planning authorities should not approve additional developments where existing applicants have failed to comply with the conditions attached to their granted permissions.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>David O’Neill</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, citing that recent development has far outpaced supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>Concerns include frequent water outages, substandard road conditions between Mackeys Cross and Kerry Pike, unsafe pedestrian conditions due to the absence of a continuous footpath, lack of public transport and safe cycling routes, speeding traffic with inadequate calming measures, and the failure to deliver crèche facilities required under previous permissions.</p> <p>The submission concludes that no further development should proceed until these critical infrastructure deficiencies are comprehensively addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Niamh Ní Chiara</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed zoning of two new residential neighbourhoods adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the grounds that the area lacks the necessary infrastructure to support further development. Millboro and other nearby housing schemes are still under construction, yet pedestrian, road, and transport infrastructure remains inadequate.</p>			

There are no safe or continuous footpaths, and residents must cross a busy road to access the playground and school. Roads throughout Kerry Pike are in poor condition, and traffic congestion, particularly from Morgan’s Hill, has significantly worsened, preventing some residents from exiting estates during peak hours.

The area has no public transport and is unsafe for cycling, leaving residents entirely reliant on private cars. The submission argues that additional zoning would exacerbate congestion, undermine sustainable transport objectives, and contribute to urban sprawl, threatening both quality of life and the established community character of Kerry Pike.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sandra Barter</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas, from City Hinterland (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2).

It is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with planning policy and lacks adequate supporting infrastructure. Concerns are noted regarding traffic congestion, insufficient public transport, existing drainage, flooding, and subsidence issues. Limited consideration is believed to have been given to access of essential services such as schools and healthcare.

It is also considered that the development would negatively impact the environment, i.e. biodiversity, increase pollution, and worsen pedestrian safety. The area is regarded as an important greenbelt that should be preserved.

A more sustainable alternative, such as rezoning for recreational use (e.g. a Regional Park), is suggested. It is requested that approval of the proposed rezoning be withheld pending a more strategic planning approach.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Bernadette and Hugh Graham</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission acknowledges the need for housing however objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas (SE 2) as they do not believe that it represents an appropriate or sustainable solution. The key concerns outlined are as follows.

The delivery of housing developments primarily to meet numerical targets results in:

- Overdevelopment without adequate supporting infrastructure,
- increasing pressure on existing roads and services
- the lack of meaningful amenities and community facilities
- developments that lack identity, character and a sense of community
- and finally, this pattern diminishes the quality of life of future and existing residents.

The submission recommends the retention and enhancement of the site as green space. The submission highlights that nearby attractions, such as Lapland “milk farm” demonstrates a strong public demand for accessible and family-friendly outdoor green spaces which have become increasingly rare.

Concerns are also raised that developing the site could prevent Douglas Hall’s ability to expand and improve which rezoning the land for green space could enable.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Daniel O’Sullivan</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission formally objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at NW 3, Kerry Pike from ZO 20 to ZO 02 under Variation No. 3. The objection is not to housing itself but to the timing of the rezoning, arguing that local infrastructure has failed to keep pace with the rapid growth already permitted.

Kerry Pike has expanded from 174 homes in 2018 to more than 620 in 2026, far exceeding the Development Plan guideline that new development should not exceed 10% of the existing village population. Key infrastructure deficits remain unresolved: no continuous footpath, a delayed pedestrian scheme, no public transport following the shelving of BusConnects, and severe peak-hour congestion. Residents also experience frequent water and power outages. Community services have not expanded in line with growth, with limited school capacity, no childcare facility, no local shop, and previous commitments for such services removed by developers.

The submission further notes that the site lies on or near the preferred route of the North Ring Road, and rezoning could compromise this strategic project.

It concludes that Kerry Pike has already absorbed disproportionate growth without the promised supporting infrastructure and requests that the proposed rezoning at NW 3 be removed from the Variation.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brian Murphy</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission requests a number of changes to the wording of section 10.286A regarding NE1 (proposed zoning change from ZO 17 to ZO 2).

1. The site is located on an open hilltop within the City’s Hinterland. It argues that the proposed change conflicts with existing policy in Chapter 6, Section 6.36, which emphasises the need to protect open hilltops, valley sides and ridges in the City’s Hinterland due to their strategic role in defining the city’s landscape character and structure.
2. The submission critiques the wording of Section 10.286A, suggesting it implies the creation of an access corridor through existing private housing developments without any consultation. It highlights that these developments are on a gradient, which undermines efforts to provide active travel corridors to/through them. The roads are of poor condition, narrow, with many 90° bends, and there is limited green space, and a lack of play facilities. Routing additional traffic through these areas would create safety risks due to increased volume and poor sightlines.
3. Proposed lands are not served by existing or planned cycle networks or public transport, and are located more than 400 metres from the nearest bus stop. As a result, it argues

that future residents will be heavily reliant on private cars, exacerbating the already high car dependency in Glanmire.

4. The submission highlights the lack of progress on the Glanmire Town Centre Framework (set as Objective 10.68 of CCDP), which aimed to create a distinctive town centre with a focus on sustainable and active travel,
5. The proposed location of a North East Regional Park will be largely inaccessible to the majority of Glanmire without a car.

Overall, the submission concludes that the proposal would increase car usage and therefore the wording of 10.286A should be amended to exclude vehicular access through existing estates. In addition, the submission calls for significant expansion of active travel and public transport infrastructure, including extending cycle and pedestrian networks northwards using appropriate gradient standards.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	161	From:	Jillian O’Sullivan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed re-zoning near Millboro, Kerry Pike. While recognising the need for housing, it argues that Kerry Pike cannot sustain further development without basic infrastructure. Four estates are already under construction, yet the area still has no crèche, no shop, no bus service, and poor pedestrian links. The long-promised bus route has stalled with no completion date, and morning traffic delays already reach 10 minutes just to exit onto Prospect Hill. The submission concludes that additional housing is unacceptable without parallel investment in essential community infrastructure.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	162	From:	Ida Collins
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to additional housing development in Kerry Pike on the basis that essential supporting infrastructure is absent or already under severe strain. The area has no bus service, peak-time traffic regularly comes to a standstill, and the lack of pedestrian infrastructure makes walking unsafe. The local primary school has not expanded to meet population growth, and there is no available childcare, as previously promised crèche and preschool facilities were never delivered. There are no commercial units or local shops, and residents frequently experience pressure on water and electricity services. The submission argues that further development is inappropriate until these fundamental infrastructure deficits are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sam Lawrance</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to any further rezoning or housing development in Kerry Pike. It states that the number of homes in the village has increased dramatically in recent years (approximately fourfold) without any corresponding improvements to essential infrastructure. No road upgrades have been delivered, traffic congestion has worsened, and recurring potholes remain unresolved. There is still no bus service, no shop, and no childcare facilities, despite such services being required under previous planning permissions.</p> <p>The submission notes that ongoing construction has resulted in persistent noise, disruption, traffic issues, and even property damage. It argues that the current level of development is already unsustainable and that allowing additional housing would raise serious concerns about planning oversight. The volume of public objections is cited as evidence of widespread community concern.</p> <p>The submission concludes that no further development should proceed until fundamental infrastructure deficits are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Simon Shannon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission requests that this land be kept as a green belt.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Patrick Stacey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission does not object to housing development in principle but expresses concern that the existing road infrastructure is not suitable to accommodate a significant increase in traffic, such as an estimated additional 500 cars per day on Hazelwood Hill. Also, no detail has been given as to how this volume of traffic can be safely managed. Maintaining existing infrastructure would provide confidence, e.g. resurfacing existing roads in estates which pose risks to wheelchair users, prams and buggies.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Finola O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas (SE 2) for the following reasons:			

- Concerns over stormwater drainage and flooding regarding stated issues with flooding occurring on Moneygourney Road and surrounding areas, which has been intensified by the construction of nearby developments. It is submitted that no further development should occur in the area until city level drainage infrastructure has been provided to the area to match the city level density that would be expected on the site and suitable assessments are carried out with an associated infrastructure plan.
- Concerns that the area lacks the wider community infrastructure needed to support a major increase to the population including schools, childcare facilities, GP services, recreational amenities, and community spaces The submitter is concerned expanding the population before expanding these essential services will undermine the quality of life in the wider community and that roads and public transport services will be significantly impacted by the level of intensification that would be expected on the site.
- Concerns about the continued loss of greenbelt lands around Douglas and Rochestown which it is submitted provide important wildlife habitats, natural drainage and valuable open space for residents.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eddie Kelliher</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission strongly objects to any further rezoning or major residential development in Kerry Pike (NW 3) unless supported by clear, funded and deliverable infrastructure upgrades. It states that the village has already undergone substantial housing growth without corresponding improvements to essential services.

Key deficits highlighted include the absence of safe, continuous footpaths; no public transport; no cycle infrastructure; no childcare provision; and a lack of local services. Roads have deteriorated due to sustained construction traffic, and residents report repeated interruptions to water and electricity. The submission notes concern that housing growth has exceeded the Development Plan’s indicative limit, suggesting development has outpaced the area’s capacity.

It argues that further rezoning would place an unfair burden on the existing community and constitutes poor planning unless preceded by significant upgrades to transport, pedestrian safety, childcare, utilities, and local amenities.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin Lally</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission states that Kerry Pike is under-served in public transport, pedestrian infrastructure, and road capacity, noting that the area lacks adequate bus services, safe walkways, and sufficient road infrastructure to support existing demand.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Fiona O’Brien</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission expresses concern that existing infrastructure in Kerry Pike is already insufficient for the current population and traffic levels. It notes deficits in public transport, road capacity, pedestrian pathways, and local facilities, and highlights the need for a bus route, improved roads, safer walkways, and additional community amenities.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Bernard Bhattacharya</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield Heights/Glashaboy Heights. The roads are not suitable for the significant additional traffic, and it would also lead to a safety issue for the children who play daily.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Caroline Collins Powell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission recommends the installation of a playground, a scout base, and a scouting area for the Douglas scout group who have availed of many hikes and walks in the area. Notes that with the outdoors and green spaces being so precious nowadays, it is important to preserve as many green spaces as possible.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Frank Nevin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of an 8-acre site for additional residential development in Kerry Pike. It states that Kerry Pike has already experienced substantial housing growth without the delivery of essential supporting infrastructure. Current deficits highlighted include the absence of public transport, inadequate pedestrian infrastructure, recurring power outages, and a lack of local amenities such as shops, childcare facilities, and pharmacies.			
The submission notes that Lower Woodlands estate still has no safe footpath to the main road, requiring residents to walk on a narrow and unsafe roadway. It also references recent service-connection works for a new estate that caused prolonged disruption and resulted in a sinkhole outside Lower Woodlands, raising concerns about the capacity and resilience of existing infrastructure.			

Given these ongoing deficiencies, the submission concludes that further rezoning for residential development would be inappropriate until infrastructure and service issues are properly addressed.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Áine Murphy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike due to severe infrastructure deficits. The area has experienced significant housing growth without matching road capacity, footpaths, or safety measures. Traffic congestion is constant, cycling is no longer safe, pedestrian facilities are inadequate, and heavy goods vehicles are unsuitable for local roads. Excessive vehicle speeds, poor road surfaces, and lack of facilities mean Kerry Pike cannot accommodate further development at this time.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kathryn Buttimore (Withdrawn)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN DUE TO DUPLICATION REFER TO SUBMISSION CRK-C378-CDPV3-256</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Darren Townsend</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to further rezoning or large-scale housing development in Kerry Pike, stating that recent residential growth has not been matched by necessary infrastructure. It highlights ongoing deficits in safe footpaths, pedestrian crossings, public transport, cycle lanes, childcare facilities, and local services. The road network is described as deteriorated due to construction traffic, and residents have experienced repeated water and electricity interruptions. The submission also notes concern that current housing growth exceeds what was originally planned. It concludes that further rezoning should be deferred until substantial, funded infrastructure improvements are in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>James Smith</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for additional housing however, objects to the rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas and raises a number of concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the development would result in the loss of valuable green belt land furthering urban sprawl whilst negatively impacting the natural environment, biodiversity and natural character of the area.</li> <li>• That the scale and density of the proposed site would be out of character with the existing development pattern in the area and rezoning the site would set a concerning precedent for further large-scale development on greenbelt lands.</li> <li>• Concerns that local infrastructure and services are already under pressure and a development of this scale would only increase these issues particularly congestion and road safety.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Robert Fitzgerald</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning, stating that further development in Kerry Pike is inappropriate without significant infrastructure upgrades. It highlights that substantial residential growth has already occurred without corresponding improvements to essential services. Identified deficits include inadequate water and road infrastructure, the absence of a bus service, lack of local shops and amenities originally promised in earlier developments, and the continued absence of safe and connected pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>The submission notes that childcare facilities, pharmacies and other community services referenced in previous planning have not been delivered. It also raises concern that existing planning conditions have not been fully adhered to, while additional land is now being sought for development. The volume of public objections is cited as evidence of widespread community concern.</p> <p>The submission concludes that approving further rezoning in the current context would place additional strain on an already under-served area and would undermine confidence in the planning process.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Claire Mackey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission highlights the following issues in Kerry Pike: lack of services, poor infrastructure, frequent water outages, daily traffic congestion, and no bus route.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Patrick Galvin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission states that existing infrastructure in Kerry Pike is not adequate for the current population, citing severe morning traffic congestion, frequent water-service breakdowns, and unsafe conditions caused by vehicles speeding through the village. It objects to any new housing development on the basis that it would worsen already difficult and unsafe conditions for residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eileen Clarke</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission states that Kerry Pike lacks the infrastructure needed to support existing demand, noting the absence of street lighting, public transport, footpaths, and that local roads are too narrow for already congested traffic. It raises these deficiencies as concerns in relation to site-specific zoning proposals.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Saurabh Gupta</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission notes that several infrastructure issues remain unresolved before new residential development is considered. It highlights traffic congestion during school runs, the lack of continuous pedestrian pathways, and the need for bus stops.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Catherine Starkie</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to additional housing in Kerry Pike, citing severe traffic congestion, unsafe and incomplete pedestrian routes, narrow roads, and frequent water-service interruptions. It notes long delays accessing the Lee Road, safety issues for pedestrians near Woodside and Raven’s Court, and the absence of promised amenities such as footpaths, buses, wider roads, crèches and shops. The submission reflects long-standing resident frustration and requests that no further development proceed until essential infrastructure is delivered.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	183	From:	Amy Conway
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the rezoning of the Moneygourney/Johnstown area from hinterland (greenbelt) to residential use, which it is stated has been maintained for over 40 years for environmental and air quality benefits.</p> <p>It is considered that this proposal continues poorly planned development in Douglas/Rochestown, where significant housing growth has not been matched with adequate amenities or infrastructure. Concerns are noted regarding the lack of recreational facilities, loss of community resources, and insufficient provision for future population needs.</p> <p>It is believed that strategic planning should be undertaken prior to any rezoning, with land reserved for recreational use such as a regional park and improved cycle infrastructure. Existing issues with road capacity, traffic congestion, flooding, and water supply are considered unresolved and likely to worsen.</p> <p>Further concerns relate to the area’s elevated and visible location, along with the risk of urban sprawl</p> <p>It is suggested that key infrastructure corridors for a north south LUAS be protected for future development.</p> <p>It is requested that the proposal be reconsidered, and that a more comprehensive, community-focused approach be adopted before any rezoning is approved and that an area is provided for a Regional Park, and cycle links, to provide for a living rather than a commuting community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	184	From:	Robert Sheehan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of NE1, contending that it does not take proper account of the existing community, the large number of houses in the area and the volume of traffic already in the area. Concerns are as follows:</p> <p>Access/Traffic congestion: The local road network in Glanmire was not designed for the volume of traffic in the area which has led to extreme traffic congestion especially at peak times. More housing would place increased pressure throughout Hazelwood and Crestfield estates and on the exit at the end of the hill on to Hazelwood Road. This junction has become more congested and dangerous as a result of the recent changes in the road layout. The increased congestion on the local roads will result in noise pollution and create safety risks for residents, especially children, pedestrians, and cyclists.</p> <p>Environmental impact: Rezoning the greenfield land and natural open space would negatively impact biodiversity, local amenity, and the character of the area.</p> <p>Pressure on Existing Estates and Local Services: providing access to a new housing development through the Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates would put an unacceptable burden on existing infrastructure. Many of the roads and access routes are narrow and lack adequate pedestrian facilities. This would lead to safety concerns for adults and children living in the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Faye Mackey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission highlights the following issues in Kerry Pike: insufficient services, poor infrastructure, no public transport, no local shop, traffic congestion, no footpaths in particular areas.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michael Doyle</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission raises concern about the proposed rezoning of agricultural land near the Millboro estate in Kerry Pike, citing a severe mismatch between housing growth and supporting infrastructure. Traffic and pedestrian activity have increased significantly, while promised bus services, crèches, and adequate footpath upgrades have not been delivered. Ongoing issues with water supply and poor road surfaces are also highlighted, with particular concern for the safety of children and older residents moving through the village.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mary Allen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission highlights severe pressure on Kerry Pike due to a lack of essential infrastructure, including continuous footpaths, a bus service, and childcare facilities. While there is no objection to housing in principle, further development is considered unsafe until infrastructure is delivered. Heavy traffic, car dependency, and dangerous road conditions are causing particular difficulties for residents with buggies and pedestrians, especially when accessing village amenities.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ian Crossan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission states that the proposed rezoning of agricultural land behind the Millboro estate in Kerry Pike should only proceed if previously promised infrastructure and services are delivered first. It notes that residents are not opposed to new housing in principle, but that essential improvements, including footpaths, traffic-calming measures, and childcare facilities, are required before additional development can be supported.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kenneth Holland</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed development, stating that existing infrastructure in Kerry Pike is already under significant strain. It highlights ongoing issues such as repeated water shortages, ESB outages, and overall demand exceeding current service capacity. The submission argues that the village is not prepared for additional housing and that infrastructure deficiencies must be addressed before any new proposals are considered.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kenneth Cullinane</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission expresses concern that too many houses have already been built in Kerry Pike, placing pressure on local infrastructure. It cites reduced water pressure, a recent pipe leak attributed to demand, increasing traffic, and growing safety risks for children. The submission objects to further development until these issues are addressed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Annemarie Doyle</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the rezoning of NE 1, noting that the area was safe for children to play outside when they bought their house in the area, but that further development would make the area much busier. They highlight that they have endured years of roadworks and do not want to be dealing with that again.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Geraldine Hynes</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission highlights that there are already issues in Kerry Pike village that need addressing before any new residential infrastructure goes in. Highlights the following: better roads needed for the increasing volume of traffic owing to new residential infrastructure; constant issues with electricity supply and water supply outages; new groundwork to be put in before new roads laid.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jimmy Hynes</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the proposed residential rezoning of land in Kerry Pike. Highlights that the traffic in the village is very dangerous, and that the community were promised raised platforms in the village to slow down speeding cars and this has not been delivered. In addition, infrastructure in the village must be improved before more houses are built.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nireen Hickey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to further rezoning for housing in Kerry Pike, noting that over 400 homes have been built in recent years without matching infrastructure upgrades. Key deficits include the absence of a bus service, inadequate footpaths, unreliable water supply, poor broadband, and a lack of shops and childcare facilities. The view expressed is that no additional housing should be permitted until essential infrastructure is improved.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mairead Bourke</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of agricultural land for housing, stating that Kerry Pike is already at capacity in terms of infrastructure. Ongoing power and water outages, poor and incomplete footpaths, and lack of local services mean residents are heavily dependent on cars, making walking unsafe for families and older people. Promised community amenities, including a crèche, have not been delivered in existing developments, undermining confidence in future commitments. Given the scale of the proposed site and existing deficits, the view expressed is that further development would exceed the village’s resources.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Norma Fitzgerald</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, on the basis that existing infrastructure and essential services are already inadequate for the current population. Key issues raised include severe traffic congestion, lack of public transport, unsafe and narrow footpaths, poor road capacity, and frequent water and electricity disruptions linked to ongoing development. The view expressed is that Kerry Pike cannot sustainably accommodate further housing and that the proposed rezoning should be refused.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Deirbhile Hegarty</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike due to inadequate infrastructure and the cumulative impact of existing and permitted developments. Traffic is already excessive, roads are narrow and in poor condition, and there are no effective traffic-calming measures. Footpaths are incomplete and unsafe, with no pedestrian crossings, putting schoolchildren at risk. School capacity is limited, promised crèche facilities have not been delivered, and there is no bus service despite long-standing plans. Overall, the area cannot accommodate additional development until these deficits are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Thomas Wallace</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission would support additional housing in Kerry Pike if it was being developed sustainably, but they highlight significant issues in the area, including inadequate services, poor roads infrastructure, lack of public transport, absence of shops and childcare facilities, traffic congestion, and missing footpaths in parts of Kerry Pike. They also note that promised improvements from previous planning permissions have not been delivered and argue that infrastructure upgrades should come before any further housing development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Laura Jordan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the rezoning of land by Crestfield Heights as the existing road infrastructure, even if widened in sections, is unsuitable for additional traffic volumes. It is a narrow and built-up residential area, and an increase in traffic congestion could heighten the risk of road safety issues for children at play, local residents, pedestrians and motorists. The submission contends that the proposal is not supported by the existing roads, and an increase of traffic would have a direct negative effect on the quality of life, safety and well-being of existing residents in the surrounding areas.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Egidijus Girgzda</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of land for development in the vicinity of Crestfield/Hazelwood Estate, Glanmire, Cork. Submission contends that this development would result in a substantial increase in traffic volume, including through-traffic, which the road is neither designed nor intended to accommodate. In addition, this development will increase noise levels and disturbance, undermining the quiet nature of Crestfield &amp; Hazelwood estates. This will negatively impact the quality of life for all residents while reducing residential amenity and enjoyment of our homes.</p> <p>Further objection on the grounds that the proposal would significantly impact the limited amenity space currently available to our children. The safety of our children is monumental and cannot be compromised. This development will result in a significant and unacceptable deterioration in residential amenity and road safety.</p> <p>Objection respectfully requests that rezoning is rejected, and that a substantial redesign implemented to ensure that access to the new development is provided via more appropriate routes that do not compromise existing residential areas and cul-de-sacs within Crestfield/Hazelwood. The Cul-de-sacs and current infrastructure must remain unchanged. An alternative access/ exit route should be sought and not imposed upon residents of Crestfield and Hazelwood estates, who have nothing to gain from this development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Conal Crossan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission states that Kerry Pike lacks sufficient infrastructure to support further housing development. Key issues raised include the absence of local public transport, failure by developers to deliver promised facilities such as a crèche, shop, and pharmacy, and repeated alterations to granted planning permissions without adequate enforcement.</p> <p>The submission highlights a lack of consideration for existing residents in relation to road capacity and transport provision.</p> <p>Severe traffic congestion is reported at peak times, particularly around Kerry Pike school and the Morgans Hill junction, with concerns that additional development would worsen delays and increase safety risks for children.</p> <p>The view expressed is that no further development should be permitted until these infrastructure deficiencies are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Deirdre Burke</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission strongly objects to further rezoning of the farmland above Crestfield residential estate. The increase in traffic in the estate would make it unsafe for children to walk or play outside. Traffic increase would exacerbate existing congestion. At present the new layout can't handle current traffic and parking going to work and school. Noise and general pollution would be hugely increased leading to an unnecessary hazard, there would be health and safety risks to residents, and the local environment of green areas would be destroyed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Clogheen Kerry Pike Community Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission acknowledges the need for additional housing but raises concerns about rezoning agricultural land in Kerry Pike without first delivering essential supporting infrastructure. It notes that recent housing growth has not been matched by investment in roads, pedestrian safety, public transport, utilities, childcare facilities, or community amenities.			
The submission highlights increasing traffic congestion, inadequate pedestrian routes, pressure on water and power services, and impacts on daily life. It requests that infrastructure improvements be prioritised before any further development is approved.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Donal O’Sullivan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission strongly objects to further rezoning of the farmlands above Crestfield, Riverstown, as it will increase noise and light pollution, and the increased traffic through the estate will be a danger to older residents and to young children playing in the area. Increased traffic congestion has made local roads unsafe for children traveling to school and nearby amenities. In addition, rezoning would harm the natural beauty of the area, alter its character, and negatively impact local wildlife.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Regina Cullen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission acknowledges the need for housing in Glanmire (NE 1) but is concerned about the proposed transport and access arrangements, particularly the possibility of increased traffic through the existing estates. The road network is under pressure, particularly at peak hours, with narrow roads, restricted visibility and onstreet parking reducing driving space. The infrastructure is not capable of accommodating an increased volume of traffic. In addition, given the location of services and amenities, the proposed layout could encourage through-traffic and shortcutting, thereby altering the quiet character of the estates, and increasing risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and children. Submission highlights the contradiction between the objective of promoting active travel and then increasing traffic on those same routes. Submission questions whether detailed transport/traffic analysis has been conducted to prove that existing network can absorb the cumulative traffic impacts. Resident believes that any significant future development of these lands should be dependent upon the provision of appropriate infrastructure and a dedicated access strategy that does not place additional pressure on long established residential estates.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Joe Mulligan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for housing but objects to further rezoning at Kerry Pike due to the scale of recent development without supporting services. Housing has increased dramatically while traffic levels, road safety risks, and car dependency have worsened. The area lacks traffic controls, safe footpaths, cycle lanes, and a sustainable bus service, making walking and cycling unsafe, including for school journeys. The view expressed is that infrastructure and services must be delivered first, as further housing would exacerbate existing safety, traffic, and sustainability issues.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Peter Hegarty</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike due to significant pressure from ongoing and recent developments without supporting infrastructure. Key concerns include unsafe roads, lack of traffic calming, missing footpaths, severe traffic congestion, no bus service, and frequent water outages linked to construction. While acknowledging the housing crisis, the view expressed is that additional development would be unsafe and irresponsible until existing infrastructure deficiencies are resolved.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John O’Keeffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the rezoning of SW1 and SW2 lands near Barrett’s Farm, Togher, citing serious infrastructure, environmental, and social service impacts. The local road network is already congested, with frequent gridlock affecting access to schools, hospitals, and essential home-care services, including carers attending residents. Additional development would further strain roads and increase heavy goods vehicle traffic. Concern is also raised about pressure on already stretched social services, healthcare, and school capacity.</p> <p>The lands were previously designated as green space near the airport, and objections are raised to residential development under flight paths.</p> <p>Ongoing flood risk from surface water runoff is highlighted, with concerns that development would exacerbate flooding despite recent mitigation works.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Peter Mulcahy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission highlights that Kerry Pike has experienced rapid population growth without corresponding infrastructure improvements. Key concerns include increased traffic with insufficient calming measures, incomplete footpaths, lack of a nearby bus service, and failure to deliver promised crèche facilities. It is stated that no further housing should be zoned until these infrastructure deficits are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Gintare S.</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE1. Concerns are raised regarding an increase in traffic volumes, including through-traffic, which the road is not designed to accommodate. In addition, development would increase noise levels and disturbance, negatively impacting quality of life. The proposal would also reduce amenity space for children and deteriorate road safety. The submission requests that alternative access routes be considered/designed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Doireann Kelliher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike due to ongoing infrastructure failures despite substantial residential growth. Residents report unsafe walking conditions for children, excessive traffic, speeding, damaged roads, and frequent service outages. Promised infrastructure such as a bus service, footpath connections, amenities, a crèche, and traffic controls have not been delivered. Housing levels have increased far beyond recommended limits without corresponding upgrades, and further development is considered unsafe and unsustainable for the community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jason Ryan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the rezoning of a 16.9 hectare site at Moneygourney from Strategic Environmental Reserve to New Residential Neighbourhood, citing serious infrastructure, environmental, and amenity concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Risk and drainage: existing surface water from the site already floods neighbouring properties. The development would significantly increase runoff, with no drainage details provided.</li> <li>• Loss of Amenity (Light &amp; Noise): the area currently benefits from low light levels and is a quiet rural setting. New development would introduce significant light pollution and traffic noise, particularly from a proposed access road adjacent to the property.</li> <li>• Traffic and Road Safety: the local roads are already at capacity with poor safety conditions, inadequate footpaths, and heavy congestion. Additional development would worsen traffic and safety issues without a transport plan.</li> <li>• Environmental Impact: the site supports protected species (bats, badgers, hedgehogs) and valuable hedgerows. There is no adequate ecological assessment, and rezoning would result in biodiversity loss.</li> <li>• Lack of Infrastructure &amp; services: the schools, childcare, healthcare, public transport, and recreational facilities in the area are already overstretched, with no clear plans to expand capacity alongside development.</li> <li>• Utilities Capacity: existing electricity and water services are unreliable, indicating insufficient capacity to support further development.</li> <li>• The proposal is seen as developer-led and premature, lacking key supporting documents such as an Urban Design Framework, transport strategy, and infrastructure delivery plans, contrary to proper planning principles. There are over 1,050 approved but unbuilt homes in the area (Bayly and Castletreasure developments) making it impossible to assess the true cumulative impact on infrastructure and services.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, the rezoning is considered premature, inadequately supported, and likely to cause unacceptable harm to residents, infrastructure, and the environment and the proposal should be refused until all necessary studies, infrastructure plans, and cumulative impact assessments are completed and demonstrate that development can proceed sustainably.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	213	From:	John D.
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission relates to proposed rezonings at SW1 and SW2 Lehenaghmore and raises concerns about the uncoordinated and unsustainable nature of development in the area. While acknowledging the need for housing, the submitter argues that large-scale residential growth has occurred without the parallel delivery of basic amenities, infrastructure, or services, resulting in total car dependency and poor quality of life for residents. Lehenaghmore is identified as lacking essential facilities such as schools, healthcare, childcare, shops, community spaces, playgrounds, and safe pedestrian infrastructure, which is contrary to the Cork City Development Plan objective of a “15-minute city”.</p> <p>The submission notes a lack of confidence among residents that engagement influences outcomes and calls for a Local Area Plan to guide coherent future development. It recommends that no further housing be commenced until existing, partially completed developments (notably the Manor Farm complex) are delivered and operational.</p> <p>The submission provides constructive proposals, referenced in an attachment, including: completion of Manor Farm amenities; delivery of a short connecting footpath to improve public transport access; a southern distributor road, implementation of the planned Cork City–Viaduct Greenway; provision of a playground; enhanced road connectivity; greater public access to Lehenaghmore Park; improved pedestrian links; expanded greenway connections to Tramore Valley Park and Douglas; and inclusion of local retail or café uses in future plans. The overall position is that services and infrastructure must be delivered alongside, or in advance of, further residential development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	214	From:	Karen Cronin
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission expresses concern that the Crestfield/Hazelwood housing estate in Glanmire could be used as the entrance to a proposed new housing estate in Sallybrook. The submission highlights that this would have a hugely negative impact on the lives of the current residents, as the estate does not have the infrastructure to support additional traffic and it would only amplify the ongoing traffic problems. Submission contends that traffic congestion is a daily issue as this is a very built-up area; that it is difficult to drive freely through the estates as, owing to lack of parking spaces, cars park on the road; and that it is also challenging to turn onto the main road owing to the volume of cars. Submission also highlights that children in the estate do not have enough recreational space where they can play, and additional traffic could affect the few areas they have, as well as the children’s safety.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>James Daly</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission highlights significant deficiencies in infrastructure in the Lehenaghmore area and expresses frustration at long-standing neglect. It notes that many residents lack confidence in the planning process and therefore do not make submissions. While acknowledging the housing crisis and the need for new homes, the submitter argues that further development in Lehenaghmore should not proceed until substantial investment in infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>Key concerns include the absence of basic amenities such as a shop, school, GP, and playground, alongside chronic traffic congestion and road capacity issues. The submission states that planned road improvements will be insufficient given existing pressures and future population growth. The need for proper bus lanes, delivery of the City-to-Viaduct Phase 1 greenway, and additional road connections out of Lehenaghmore is emphasised to reduce car dependency.</p> <p>The submission calls for a pause on further building and the preparation of a comprehensive development plan for the entire Lehenaghmore area to ensure a sustainable and well-serviced suburb. It is requested that Cork City Council address the significant infrastructure deficit before permitting any additional development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jerry O’Regan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes rezoning c. 8.9 hectares from ZO 20 City Hinterland to residential use. It states that the lands are adjacent to the site of the proposed Elective Hospital at St. Stephen’s Hospital and benefit from existing and planned infrastructure, including proximity to water, wastewater and gas services, and proposed new road connections to the M8. The submission states that the lands are not constrained by flood risk or the route protection corridor for the Cork North Ring Road and are therefore readily developable. It further states that the site would support housing delivery in the area without significantly increasing traffic in Glanmire, given its accessibility to the wider road network.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 42			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Adam Duggan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Lehenaghmore on the grounds of heritage, environmental, flooding, and traffic concerns.</p> <p>The submission states that the lands contain areas of historical and archaeological significance, including 19th-century structures, older stone buildings, walls, and laneways, some of which have already been damaged.</p> <p>The submission also highlights flood risk within the proposed lands, noting inadequate drainage and existing flooding of nearby homes.</p> <p>Concerns are raised about the loss of wildlife habitats, including those of bats and other protected species, and the unsuitability of the local road network to accommodate additional traffic from new housing.</p> <p>The objection is primarily based on the protection of historical features, archaeological heritage, and biodiversity, and the view that the lands are not suitable for residential development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Raymond Cosgrove</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission raises concerns that proposed rezoning NE1 would necessitate access for the new estate running through the Crestfield &amp; Hazelwood estates, contending that this would be detrimental to the quiet nature of the well-established cul-de-sac, and that accessibility, sustainability, capacity and safety would all be compromised. Contrary to the objective, traffic volumes would not be reduced. Submission notes that the estate’s road infrastructure was built 30 years ago for a community which has now doubled in size; that roads are narrow, and footpaths less than 1m in places. Any changes to the road network would halt the residents’ attempts to improve the unique nature of the estate.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tanya Price</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission states that footpaths in Kerry Pike are inadequate and that traffic volumes are already too high for the narrow road width. This creates unsafe conditions, particularly for children travelling to and from school, and further traffic would increase the danger.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Helen Kelly</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike, stating that the area is already saturated with new housing developments without the necessary supporting infrastructure. Concerns include significant traffic congestion on roads not designed for current volumes, inadequate or missing footpaths making walking, particularly to school, unsafe, and pressure on public services, evidenced by frequent water and electricity disruptions. While not opposing housing in principle, the submission emphasises that further residential development should not proceed until essential infrastructure for existing and future residents is put in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Roisin O’Donnell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes further housing development in Kerry Pike until significant infrastructure improvements are delivered. While acknowledging the importance of future growth, it is stated that the area currently lacks essential amenities, particularly a local shop, and suffers from poor transport infrastructure. Ongoing issues include severe traffic congestion, a major bottleneck within the village, no bus service, and incomplete or missing footpaths, resulting in heavy car dependency even for short local journeys. The view expressed is that additional housing at this time would exacerbate these existing pressures, and that development should only proceed once infrastructure and amenities are adequately addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ben Jacob</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield/Hazelwood in Glanmire, contending that there is increasing pressure on local infrastructure and services and rezoning could exacerbate this, thereby negatively impacting the community’s quality of life. They highlight that the local road network is already under strain, with regular congestion in surrounding estates, particularly during peak times. The existing roads are narrow and were never designed to function as through-routes for additional development. Further development without substantial infrastructure upgrades would likely increase congestion, journey times, and safety risks. The submission notes significant pressure on local services arising from population growth, particularly in healthcare, retail and community facilities. The submission raises concerns regarding the loss of greenfield land, which currently acts as a natural buffer, supports biodiversity and contributes to the character and amenity of the area. Also highlighted is the potential for increased noise and air pollution due to additional traffic, with possible impacts on public health. Finally, the submission argues that the proposal is inconsistent with principles of sustainable development, given the existing strain on infrastructure and services.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jason Price</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission states that traffic levels in Kerry Pike are already excessive, footpaths are inadequate for safe pedestrian use, and additional traffic would create serious safety risks, particularly for schoolchildren crossing the road.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ava Lucia Mackey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission strongly objects to any further housing development in Kerry Pike, citing that the area has already experienced substantial residential growth without adequate supporting infrastructure or services.			
Key concerns include severe traffic congestion, absence of public transport, recurring power and water outages with reduced water pressure, and the lack of basic amenities such as a local shop and childcare facilities.			
The view expressed is that Kerry Pike is not suitable for additional housing at this time and that further development is not supported by existing residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Briedgeen Kerr</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission strongly objects to proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, for development. While acknowledging the need for housing, the submission states that Kerry Pike has already undergone significant residential expansion without the delivery of essential and promised infrastructure.			
Key concerns include severe traffic congestion, lack of public transport, absence of safe cycling facilities, inadequate footpaths, and insufficient traffic-calming measures, resulting in unsafe conditions for pedestrians and children. There is limited school capacity and no childcare provision, despite repeated commitments in previous developments, leading to mistrust in the planning process. Frequent water and electricity outages, lack of local amenities such as shops and pharmacies, and safety issues on surrounding roads are also highlighted. Additionally, concern is expressed regarding tree felling and loss of woodland character.			
Overall, the submission states that Kerry Pike has reached capacity for unsupported development and opposes further rezoning until infrastructure, services, and environmental protections are properly addressed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	226	From:	Jacqueline Cosgrove
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission formally objects to the proposed use of Crestfield/Hazelwood Estates as an access route for construction-related traffic and permanent access to the NE1 Sallybrook development in Glanmire. It highlights concerns about the negative impact on the safety and character of the existing cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The submission places particular emphasis on accessibility and safety issues for a resident who is a wheelchair user. It states that safe, unobstructed access and essential parking directly outside the home are critical for daily mobility, independence, safety and wellbeing, and are not merely matters of convenience.</p> <p>The submission notes that the road outside their house, approx. 5.8 metres wide, already requires careful coordination among residents to accommodate a regular bus service for the wheelchair user. It argues that the introduction of additional traffic and large construction vehicles associated with proposed development would create significant risk of obstruction and unsafe conditions, particularly given the limited road width together with resident parking.</p> <p>The submission contends that the proposed development would place additional pressure on already limited road space and parking, disproportionately affecting residents with accessibility needs. It calls on the Planning Authority to consider its responsibilities regarding accessibility, equality, and the protection of disabled residents when evaluating the application.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	227	From:	Michelle Harris
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission highlights that traffic volumes through Kerry Pike and adjoining roads are already excessively high, causing daily frustration for commuting residents. The current road network is considered unable to cope with existing demand, and the addition of further residents would significantly worsen traffic conditions.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	228	From:	John Leahy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission opposes the proposed development on behalf of his grandchildren living on Moneygourney Road. Notes that residents have been highlighting concerns about excessive speeding on the road and in the general area, and that the lack of safe footpaths poses significant risks to children walking to and from school, which the proposed development would exacerbate. Submission contends that an Environmental Assessment Report fails to adequately address the potential negative impacts on local habitats, biodiversity, and air pollution from increased traffic. Additionally, the submission highlights concern about</p>			

existing infrastructure such as drainage, sewage, and water systems. Submission also warns of the impact on Douglas Hall Sports Ground which has been trying to expand and could be forced to move; its loss would be a significant setback for the local community.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	229	From:	Helen Kehoe
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission strenuously objects to the intention that traffic from the proposed new development NE1 would be routed down through the narrow roads of an already busy estate, noting that this would adversely affect the quality of life for everyone living in the estate and should not be imposed on them.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	230	From:	John Pires
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission states that Kerry Pike lacks basic infrastructure and road safety measures. There are no safe pedestrian crossings to the school, traffic calming is absent, roads are in poor condition, and footpaths are inadequate. Public transport, taxi services, and cycleways are non-existent. These issues must be addressed urgently to protect families and support future development.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	231	From:	Eimear Lehane
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission outlines various concerns in relation to constraints in the Moneygourney area, including poor pedestrian infrastructure, limited transport capacity, significant traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting amenities such as parks, playgrounds, and community facilities and concerns about the cumulative impact of ongoing developments. It is submitted that in the absence of clear evidence that infrastructure can support further growth, the proposed rezoning is considered premature, and it is emphasised that planning decisions should prioritise long-term sustainability, infrastructure capacity, environmental protection, and community needs.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Helen Kelly</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for additional housing but objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Kerry Pike due to the absence of necessary supporting infrastructure. Despite substantial recent housing development, the area lacks public transport, local shops, footpaths, and safe pedestrian routes, resulting in heavy reliance on private cars. Traffic congestion is severe, roads are narrow, winding, and of poor quality, and vehicle speeds and heavy truck use create dangerous conditions for residents, particularly when exiting estates and for children walking in the area. The view expressed is that Kerry Pike cannot safely accommodate further development without significant infrastructure improvements.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kenneth Allen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission appreciates the need for housing across the country but notes that there is a significant shortage of playgrounds in the Moneygourney area so it would be important, when rezoning the area (SE 2), to ensure the development of a public park/playground to both provide a public amenity and to preserve some of the existing green space.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tom Collins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission accepts the requirement for more housing, but implores that there be equal consideration given to the quality of life for new and existing residents of the surrounding areas. For example, that consideration be given to the traffic issues that will arise for Maryborough Hill, Clarke’s Hill and Coach Hill; to ensure that a sufficient road network is in place to cater for the increased traffic, including cycle lanes, etc; that consideration is given to recreational areas for young and old (currently nearest amenities are far away in Tramore Valley Park, Rochestown Woods or the walkway through the Mangela); and that residents have homes with a deserved quality of living.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission sets out Infrastructure Ireland’s (TII) observations on the proposed land use changes insofar as they relate to both the existing national road network and any planned national roads in Cork City. TII states that it safeguards the strategic function of national roads to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the national road network in accordance with official policy set</p>			

out in the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (prepared by the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government, 2012)*. These Guidelines require that land development does not impact the strategic function of the national road network nor compromise the delivery of future planned national road schemes.

The submission provides observations with respect to the following land use rezonings, long term strategic development areas and roads objectives.

#### **SE 5, Jacobs Island**

TII’s submission recommends the following Site-Specific Objectives to protect the strategic function of the N40 (Cork South Ring Road):

- implementation of transport measures to address capacity requirements at the Mahon Interchange,
- any proposals in proximity or within national roads or TII managed areas shall be required to demonstrate the protection of the physical integrity and operation of N40 and associated infrastructure (such as drainage and structures) and compliance with all relevant TII Publications (Standards & Technical) requirements, and
- appropriate noise, air, dust, light, etc. mitigation measures including management, for the protection of residential amenity must form part of any future development proposals. TII notes that the cost of such requirements and any future interventions will not be borne by TII.

#### **SE 2, Moneygourney, Douglas / SE 3 Castletreasure, Douglas / SE 6 Moneygourney, Douglas**

The submission recommends that an overall traffic and transportation framework for the new communities which are emerging in the greenfield development area of Moneygourney / Castletreasure / Mount Oval is prepared which will promote a modal shift to active and sustainable travel modes, reduce dependency on the private car and also protects the function and investment made in the M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Project Motorway Scheme, as part of the EU Core TEN-T network.

#### **SW 3, Sandbrook, Wilton**

TII has recommended that the strategic function, operation, and physical integrity of the N40 (South Ring Road) is to be maintained by the inclusion of Site-Specific Objectives which addresses the following:

- implementation of transport measures to address capacity requirements at the Sarsfield Road Interchange,
- any proposals in proximity or within national roads or TII managed areas shall be required to demonstrate the protection of the physical integrity and operation of N40 and associated infrastructure (such as drainage and structures) and compliance with all relevant TII Publications (Standards & Technical) requirements, and
- appropriate noise, air, dust, light, etc. mitigation measures including management, for the protection of residential amenity must form part of any future development proposals. Costs including maintenance shall be borne by the developer.

#### **SW 10, Ballincollig (North of N22, west of Maglin Road)**

TII has recommended that the strategic function, operation and physical integrity of the N22 is to be maintained by further inclusions under Site Specific Objective 7 which address the following:

- any proposals in proximity or within national roads or TII managed areas shall be required to demonstrate the protection of the physical integrity and operation of N22 and associated infrastructure (such as drainage and structures) and compliance with all relevant TII Publications (Standards & Technical) requirements, and

- appropriate noise, air, dust, light, etc. mitigation measures including management, for the protection of residential amenity must form part of any future development proposals. Costs including maintenance shall be borne by the developer.

### **NW 3, Kerry Pike (adjacent to ‘Millboro’)**

TII has recommended the review and potentially the omission of this site and Site-Specific Objective 16 from Proposed Variation No. 3 to ensure appropriate treatment and compatibility with the delivery and implementation of the Cork City Northern Transport Project. TII have recommended that consultation with both Cork National Roads Office and TII is undertaken to address the Cork City Northern Transport Project requirements prior to any further progression with any proposed variation at this location in Kerry Pike.

### **NW 6, Ringwood, Blarney**

TII has recommended the review and potentially the omission of elements of this site from Proposed Variation No. 3 to ensure compatibility with the delivery and implementation of the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project Scheme. TII have recommended that consultation with both N/M20 Project Coordinator, Mid-West National Road Design Office and TII, is undertaken to address the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project Scheme requirements prior to any further progression with any proposed variation(s) at this location in Ringwood Blarney.

### **Chapter 3: Delivering Homes & Communities, Housing in the City Hinterland, Rural Generated Housing Section 3.51**

The submission raises concerns with regard to the proposed variation to text under *Housing in the City Hinterland Rural Generated Housing Section 3.51*. TII note that the planning authority has not sought to protect the operation, maintenance or safety of the national road network located within its jurisdiction in accordance with national, regional, and local planning policy nor to inform future applicants of specific requirements associated with national roads. The submission recommends that this issue is actively addressed prior to the adoption of Proposed Variation No. 3.

#### **Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 6

Submission No.	236	From:	Triona Quinn
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission believes the proposed rezoning at Moneygourney does not give adequate consideration to the lack of appropriate infrastructure in the greater Douglas area. Notes that Douglas is already struggling with the volume of cars on the road, and that this will only increase when the much-needed secondary school opens on the Carrigaline Road, and the Primary care centre opens in St Patrick’s Woollen Mills (estimated to bring an extra 700 cars daily).			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	237	From:	John Manley
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission opposes the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas, from City Hinterland to residential use, on the basis that it is considered premature, unsustainable, and contrary to the wider community interest. It is submitted that the area is already under			

significant strain, with ongoing traffic congestion, drainage and flooding issues, and unresolved road safety concerns, alongside the cumulative impact of multiple nearby developments that has not been fully assessed. Concern is also expressed regarding the loss of valuable greenbelt land, which it is stated provides biodiversity, natural drainage, and visual amenity, particularly following recent environmental changes associated with motorway development. It is considered that insufficient provision has been made for recreational and community infrastructure, and that alternative uses such as parkland or sports facilities would better serve the area, which would also serve the Douglas Hall Football Club which is understood to require additional space to grow and develop. A more strategic, long-term planning approach is recommended, with it suggested that the lands be retained as greenbelt, reconsidered for community use, or deferred for assessment as part of a future planning process.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	238	From:	Martin Cronin
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Lehenaghmore on the basis that it is premature and unsustainable in the absence of a strategic master development plan. The submitter highlights significant deficiencies in both physical and social infrastructure, noting that existing roads, transport, schools, childcare, and community services are already inadequate to support current development levels.</p> <p>The area lacks basic amenities, resulting in heavy car dependency and worsening traffic congestion. The ongoing road improvement scheme is acknowledged but is not expected to add capacity or address future demand. Concerns are amplified by recent approvals for additional housing without traffic assessments and the potential for further large-scale development that would significantly increase traffic volumes due to local topography.</p> <p>The submission also raises concern that rezoning may undermine long-term transport planning by sterilising a potential future transport corridor. It notes growing community frustration driven by a perceived lack of consultation and previous planning processes where local submissions were not reflected in outcomes.</p> <p>The submission seeks rejection, or at a minimum deferral, of the rezoning until a comprehensive master plan is prepared, meaningful community engagement is undertaken, and supporting infrastructure is planned and delivered in advance of further residential development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	239	From:	Jane Delaney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission requests that the land in Moneygourney (SE 2) not be rezoned for housing at this time, and the lands instead be rezoned for sports and recreational use. It is considered that the decision on rezoning should be deferred to 2030, to facilitate a sustainable plan-led approach for the benefit of the wider Douglas and Rochestown community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	240	From:	Dermot Conway
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for housing however objects to the rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas (SE 6) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that the current road infrastructure cannot support a large number of new homes and associated cars, that Maryborough Hill and Johnstown roads are constrained regarding traffic capacity and the rezoning has not expressed how further congestion will be avoided, and that the roads are in very poor condition with subsidence occurring on Moneygourney Road after recent works. It is submitted that there are issues of pedestrian safety and walkability in the area and that active travel links are missing.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding a lack of green space and play areas in the area, the lack of a community centre which is needed and concerns that local clubs are not given the room to grow, and this rezoning threatens to them in or force them out.</li> <li>• It is considered that the current strategy is more developer-led than plan-led and whilst it is acknowledged that the housing crisis is a national issue houses, the proposal would lead to sprawl.</li> <li>• The submission refers to flooding which occurred in 2012 and submits that development on the lands will lead to more flooding downhill.</li> <li>• The submission suggests that rezoning these lands should be pushed back to see what the effects of the M28 and current developments with extant planning permissions on the area are and to address the needs of the existing population.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	241	From:	Dermot Conway (Withdrawn)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
SUBMISSION REFERENCE WITHDRAWN DUE TO DUPLICATION REFER TO SUBMISSION CRK-C378-CDPV3-240			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
N/A			

Submission No.	242	From:	Dylan Collins
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission expresses support of the proposed rezoning of Moneygourney (SE 2 and SE 6), noting that if anything, it doesn't rezone enough. Highlights that the area will be well served by a Bus Connects STC as well as access to the M28 to the City Centre, Carrigaline/Ringaskiddy and N40, and that it is a perfect location to rezone as a new part of the city.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michelle Mathews</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning or site-specific objectives being applied to the land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rezoning is considered to be premature and raises concerns that the area is already under severe pressure from ongoing development and contends that basic infrastructure is not in place for existing residents, nor planned for additional residents. Roads, Public Transport, Drainage, Schools and Childcare facilities in the area are at full capacity.</li> <li>• The road network adjacent to the site is considered to be unsafe and substandard, posing daily hazards to pedestrians accessing Douglas Hall Soccer Club and that rezoning the land that is already accessed by unsafe roads would be inappropriate.</li> <li>• Concerns that the site is stated to currently experiences heavy water run directly impacting neighbouring properties and that any development will worsen this situation.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned in relation to the loss of biodiversity stating that the site hosts a wide range of wildlife, that natural corridors form critical ecological networks and raises concerns that rezoning the land will lead to the destruction of these habitats.</li> <li>• Concern is expressed over recent development patterns in the wider area which are stated to prioritise high-density schemes with little open space provided. The submitter continues that rezoning the site without guaranteeing green infrastructure will deprive residents of the natural and recreational areas essential for a healthy community.</li> <li>• The submission outlines that the area borders several industrial and pharmaceutical operations and the greenbelt lands play a vital role in carbon absorption, air quality protection and maintaining environmental balance which would be undermined by the rezoning of these lands.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Office of Public Works (OPW)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission, from OPW Flood Risk Management – Climate Adaptation and Strategic Assessments, focuses on flooding and flood risk management. It references the Guidelines on the Planning System and Flood Risk Management and the three-stage flood risk assessment process for the planning authorities to identify whether flood risk may exist, and the degree to which it is an issue, and what assessment to a scale proportionate to the risk should then be carried out: Stage 1 (flood risk identification), Stage 2 (initial flood risk assessment) and Stage 3 (detailed flood risk assessment). It references the requirement in the Guidelines that detailed assessments may be identified in county (or city) wide flood risk assessment or in the Regional Flood Risk Appraisal but should be undertaken where zoning of land is being considered within the development plan.</p> <p><b>Risk assessments</b></p> <p>The submission recommends that Cork City Council should carry out risk assessments and establish if Stage 3 flood risk assessments are required to inform the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SE 3, Castletreasure, Douglas</li> <li>• SE 6, Moneygourney, Douglas</li> <li>• SW 1, Lehenaghmore (off Togher Road)</li> <li>• SW 3, Sandbrook, Wilton</li> </ul>			

- NE 7, Cúil Chluthair, Glanmire
- NW 6, Ringwood, Blarney

#### **SE 5, Jacob’s Island, Mahon**

This site is outside the National Coast Flood Hazard Mapping present day extents, however it is difficult to assess if the lands could be at risk from climate change in the future scenarios. If the lands are within the future scenario extents Cork City Council should set out how increases in flood risk due to climate change can be managed on the site.

#### **SW 7, Lands adjacent to Ballincollig GAA grounds**

The SFRA has highlighted that these lands overlap with the mid-range future scenario mapping. The lands are largely already developed however there is an area undeveloped to the west of the site. The SFRA has noted that the site will need to comply with the provisions of the Plan. Cork City Council should reference the policy, objective or section that will manage this site or set out in the SFRA how increases in flood risk due to climate change can be managed on the site.

#### **NE 6, Ballyvolane**

The area of Flood Zone A identified at the north west of NE 6 appears to an area that flooded in 2015/2016. On examination of the EPA mapping there does not appear to be a watercourse at this location. Flood zones are determined on the basis of the probability of river and coastal flooding only. This flooding may be groundwater; Cork City Council should review if groundwater flooding should be identified as a risk.

#### **Drainage Districts**

The OPW requests that access requirements are preserved for the maintenance of Drainage Districts, in particular:

- SW 3, Sandbrook, Wilton
- LTS D, Scotch Lane, Carrigrohane
- SW 8, Flynn’s Road and Castle Road, Ballincollig
- SW 9, Greenfields Road, Ballincollig
- SW 10, Ballincollig (north of N22, west of Maglin Road)
- SW 11, Maglin, South Ballincollig
- SW 12, Maglin, South Ballincollig

#### **Nature-based Solutions and SuDS**

The OPW advises that the preparation of development plans should take account of the opportunities for nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and provide other benefits such as to water quality, biodiversity, etc. This can include in areas around existing developments, as well as within existing and proposed development in the form of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS). Cork City Council should refer to The Best Practice Interim Guidance Document ‘Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas’, as well as the Guidance Document for Planners, Developers and Developer Agents ‘Implementation of Urban Nature-based Solutions’ for further guidance. The Guidelines recommend that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provide guidance on the likely applicability of different SuDS techniques for managing surface water run-off at key development sites, and also identifies where integrated and area-based provision of SuDS and green infrastructure are appropriate in order to avoid reliance on individual site by site solutions.

#### **Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 7

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Bridgewater Developments &amp; FCDC Construction Ltd</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The subject lands comprise approximately 9 hectares located in the north-western part of the Ballyvolane Urban Expansion Area. They adjoin the Longview Strategic Housing Development (SHD), a scheme of 735 homes currently under construction. Both the subject lands and the Longview site were originally part of a larger 21.3 hectare residentially zoned area (NE-R-09) under the 2017 Cobh Municipal Area Local Area Plan. The Longview development includes provision for access links, connectivity, and infrastructure, such as potential sites for schools and open spaces, to support not only its own residents but also the future development of the adjoining subject lands. The submission requests that the Council consider the historical zoning of the subject lands and ensure consistency with the former NE R 09 zoning designation. They propose that the current Development Plan be amended to extend the ZO 02 New Residential Neighbourhood zoning to include the site.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 28			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cian O’Flynn</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes the proposed rezoning near Millboro, Kerry Pike, stating that the area has already seen significant housing growth without adequate infrastructure. Concerns include severe traffic congestion, lack of public transport, unsafe roads and footpaths, missing local services such as childcare, schools, shops, and pharmacies, and recurring water and power outages. Further development is opposed until these infrastructure and safety issues are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Kelleher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission opposes rezoning stating that it will exacerbate existing traffic congestion in Glanmire, put increased pressure on the existing road network which is not designed for increased traffic volumes, and create safety risks for road users. Submission contends that any proposal to route traffic through existing housing estates would place an unacceptable burden on existing infrastructure, and increase safety risks, particularly for children. The area lacks the infrastructure necessary to support such development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Edmond Linehan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission supports the proposed rezoning of NE 2 and considers that it will support delivery of national and Cork City policy objectives. It notes that the lands are deliverable, with developer interest in place, and considers that the rezoning will contribute positively to meeting Cork’s housing and population targets, while supporting the rebalancing of development on the northside.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 25			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Lucy Diggin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Barretts Cross, Lehenaghmore (SW 1 and SW 2). The submitter, a long-term resident, expresses frustration at what is perceived as a long history of inadequate engagement with residents and failure to deliver essential infrastructure, including transport links and road improvements. Concerns are raised that previous objections to nearby developments were ignored, leading to a lack of confidence in the planning process.			
Key issues highlighted include chronic traffic congestion with limited access routes, absence of adequate community amenities, and insufficient capacity in schools and services. The lands proposed for rezoning are described as unsuitable for housing due to their status as green zones, presence of wildlife, flood risk, and proximity to the airport flight path. The submission argues that further development should not proceed until additional roads, community facilities, and supporting infrastructure are provided, and that residents feel excluded and insufficiently informed about plans affecting their area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Minkbury Investments Limited</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission seeks a small additional rezoning at Sandbrook, Wilton (SW 3) to allow an independent access road from the R641 to lands already proposed for residential zoning. The justification is that without this limited access rezoning, the Council’s proposed residential zoning cannot be delivered in practice. The request is described as minor, proportionate, and purely enabling, aligned with national and city housing policies, and necessary to unlock timely housing delivery on a well-located urban site already accepted in principle for residential development.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 21			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Len Dowling</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate especially with the increase in population and development</li> <li>• Local health services are already under strain.</li> <li>• Insufficient public recreational facilities and community spaces. Heavy reliance on private clubs noted.</li> <li>• Lack of Parkland / Green Space</li> <li>• Loss of potential parkland and reduced environmental quality. Emphasis on the importance of green spaces for wellbeing and ecology.</li> <li>• Increased housing expected to lead to more traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Potential negative effects on biodiversity and local ecosystems. Calls for stronger consideration of sustainable development principles.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Amy Ní Laoire</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the Crestfield/Hazelwood estate Glanmire. Points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estates and their infrastructure were designed for the original amount of housing built and cannot support hundreds more houses and residents. - - The roads are too narrow and visibility is poor.</li> <li>• Additional housing would overload local roads, schools access, and shopping routes.</li> <li>• Existing accident risks would worsen with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There would be an impact on children and families as a throughway would reduce safety and limit outdoor play.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sarah O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns regarding the proposed rezoning at Kerry Pike / Millboro, noting that while there is support for housing in principle, further residential development is considered premature given existing infrastructure deficits.</p> <p>It highlights significant issues relating to traffic congestion, road safety, and road condition, as well as the absence of adequate footpaths, cycling infrastructure, and public transport, resulting in high car dependency.</p> <p>The submission also identifies shortfalls in community services, including schools, childcare, healthcare, and local amenities, together with concerns about the capacity and reliability of utilities. Overall, it states that the area has already experienced substantial growth without</p>			

corresponding infrastructure investment and advocates for an infrastructure-first approach before any further development proceeds.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	254	From:	Conor Walsh
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning (NE 1) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure deficits: Existing roads and drainage in Glashaboy already under pressure.</li> <li>• Unsafe access: Reliance on estate roads would increase traffic congestion and safety risks.</li> <li>• Environmental concerns: Potential damage to wildlife, natural land, and drainage systems.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter asks that before any rezoning is approved, the Council provide comprehensive evidence regarding traffic mitigation and environmental impacts.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	255	From:	Amanda Dorgan & Colin Lynch
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Objection to the proposed zoning change (NE 1) to the lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire. The submission raises concerns regarding safety risks associated with the anticipated level of construction and heavy vehicles/machinery that redevelopment would incur, particularly in relation to child safety, and the dirt, damage and disruption caused by heavy vehicles. Concerns are expressed regarding the quantity of houses as well as the scale and density of the development which will put pressure on existing infrastructure. Traffic congestion will be exacerbated, there will be longer delays, reduced road safety, and further strain on junctions and access routes. In addition, concern regarding the loss of green areas which contribute to the area's character, biodiversity and provide a natural buffer. Rezoning the land risks overdevelopment and the erosion of valuable environmental assets. Submission requests the proposal be reconsidered, and a comprehensive assessment of traffic management, safety measures, and environmental impact be undertaken, with meaningful engagement with local residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	256	From:	Kathryn Buttimore
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission suggests that this land at Maryborough Hill (SE 2) not be zoned for housing, to maintain its natural resources, and to promote environmental sustainability in the area. Submission raises concerns that the rezoning of approx. 20 hectares of agricultural land, currently granted green belt, will lead to careless urban sprawl, thereby violating WHO recommendations for green space within this suburban area, and failing to preserve the ecosystem for future generations. Submission also highlights that when there is an increase in</p>			

impervious surfaces, there is more ground water recharge, and polluted water run-off. Finally, it is contended that urban sprawls lead to social violations, and more pressure on Garda.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	257	From:	Rory Conway
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission highlights that while housing is needed in Moneygourney, residents also want a great place to live with amenities. Advises that years ago the car was the primary mode of transport to amenities in Douglas or elsewhere. Requests that the next generation of kids have the joy of being able to get to the local park and pitches by foot or on their bikes.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	258	From:	Cork Chamber
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission welcomes the opportunity for Cork Chamber to make a submission on the variation to the Cork City Development Plan on behalf of its 1,200 members together employing 130,000 people throughout the city, metropolitan area and county.</p> <p>The submission also includes an Economic Trends survey of Cork Chamber members for Q1 2026. This provides statistics on amongst other employment, market confidence and information on barriers to filling vacancies.</p> <p>Cork Chamber confirms their shared vision for a progressive Cork region, characterised by a high quality of life, world-class educational and cultural institutions, integrated transport and active travel networks, and support for innovation that enables firms to grow and compete on a global scale, while also attracting and retaining talent and foreign direct investment.</p> <p>Strategic planning that both enables sustainable growth and delivers environmental protection and regulatory compliance is supported together with a plan-led approach that acknowledges and responds to projected population growth in the coming decades. It outlines that this can have a pivotal role in expanding economic growth, however, it acknowledges that infrastructure deficiencies or shortfalls can impact opportunities on appropriately zoned and serviced land.</p> <p>The key issues highlighted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Transport-oriented development:</b> Aligning the re-zoning of new lands with those areas around proposed new transport corridors, including the expanded Cork Commuter Rail network, the proposed Bus Connects corridors, the planned Luas Cork route, and the proposed new Cork Northern Distributor Multi-Modal Route. This would include lands west, east and north of the city (, including areas like Blackpool, Mahon, Stoneview, and lands along the N40 on the south of the city) with the potential for tens of thousands of new homes, all supported by high-quality transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• <b>Prioritising serviced lands:</b> Lands which are already serviced or can be easily serviced with water, wastewater, transport and energy infrastructure will enable much quicker delivery of housing on the scale needed.</li> </ul>			

- **Aligning with service providers:** Work closely with Uisce Éireann, ESB Networks, EirGrid, TII and NTA to ensure that input from all key stakeholders is incorporated into strategies for the city and wider region to accelerate housing and economic growth.
- **Protect strategic lands:** In addition to a growing housing need, national strategies identify further economic development in Cork as a core priority, and it is vital that we protect lands that will be needed to deliver this industry on a large scale. This includes a potential IDA Ireland Strategic Land Bank but also needs to take heed of future transport corridors, such as expansions on the Luas Cork route to new population centres or Cork Airport, and potential new roads or lands needed to widen existing corridors. A holistic approach to the growth of the region must be at the heart of all planning.
- **Social infrastructure:** Climate-adaptation infrastructure, including flood defences, and essential amenities in health, education and childcare all need to be delivered in conjunction with housing to ensure our city remains an attractive place to live and work.

In Cork Chamber’s quarterly economic trends surveys among members, the lack of available housing is regularly identified as an issue in business growth and staff attraction. Most recent research suggest almost one-in-five businesses said housing is a barrier in their efforts to fill vacant positions, while the lack of available housing is also regularly identified as one of the top three threats to business growth.

The submission notes that lands identified between Ballincollig and Cork city represent a significant opportunity and so, too, does the land located along the proposed route for the Northern Distributor Road. These lands need to be invested in and developed as part of the variation of the current Development Plan and in future plans too.

It supports the identification and zoning of these lands now as a positive step in strengthening the pipeline for long-term development and future growth. It encourages the local authority to engage with the relevant agencies to accelerate servicing as these particular lands represent more than 40ha of well-located land that could return a substantial volume of residential development if these services were put in place. It also advocates engaging with the newly formed Housing Activation Office to identify and clear any potential roadblocks that could see these lands brought to more immediate use.

It also places a strong focus on the core city centre and the opportunities for brownfield development and in-fill housing in the existing urban centre. It notes the long-term development of areas such as the docklands present a unique and exciting opportunity to expand Cork, but we must also use this as a chance to reinvigorate areas of the existing city that have not seen new developments in recent years. The benefits of having a larger population living in the city will be felt by all stakeholders, supporting our retail and hospitality businesses and providing a form of passive-policing by those living in the city.

In parallel with the implementation of this City Development Plan variation, it notes the strategic road network requires targeted and sustained investment and it encourages Cork City Council to engage closely with all relevant stakeholders, including NTA and TII, in preparing a strategy to ensure the needs of a growing population are catered for. The Chamber strongly supports the transition towards sustainable transport, however, road infrastructure will continue to play a vital role in supporting regional connectivity and economic activity. Improved access from West Cork, East Cork and North Cork to Cork City is essential to support labour market accessibility, reduce congestion, and enable balanced regional development. Failure to address these constraints will limit the effectiveness of other infrastructure investments and inhibit growth. Supporting interventions could include reserving land for potential future rail and light rail development or the development of a range of park and ride services, including segregated bus lanes, to commercial hubs in and around the city and metropolitan area.

Sustainability remains a core principle underpinning the Chamber’s policy position. As an SDG Ambassador, Cork Chamber supports the integration of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals across all aspects of planning policy. Compact growth, investment in

public transport, renewable energy deployment, and the protection of environmental assets must remain central to the Development Plan. It notes sustainability objectives must be matched by delivery mechanisms that enable, rather than delay, critical infrastructure and housing provision.

Additionally, it is vital to ring-fence land for future commercial and infrastructural development to sustain the economic growth of the entire region, as envisaged by national policy. Housing is a pressing need but any comprehensive policy for the City – and entire southern region – must also recognise the need for future delivery in terms of strategic landbanks for industry, green energy and other commercial developments in coordination with IDA Ireland, and securing land for future transport projects.

Cork’s ability to fulfil its role as a counterbalance to Dublin and a driver of national growth is contingent on the pace of delivery. The policy framework is well established; the challenge now is implementation, and it is vital that all stakeholders collaborate to ensure this happens. In this context, Cork Chamber stresses that the success of this Development Plan variation will ultimately be measured not by policy intent, but by outcomes. There is a clear and immediate need to accelerate the delivery of housing and enabling infrastructure. This requires stronger alignment between national and local investment, streamlined processes, and a sustained focus on execution.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 8

Submission No.	259	From:	Darina Lynch
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed development at Kerry Pike (adjacent to Millboro), acknowledging the housing crisis but stating that existing infrastructure is already inadequate. Concerns include the absence of safe footpaths and cycle lanes, lack of public transport, poor road conditions, frequent water and electricity outages, and insufficient school capacity. The view expressed is that further development would place unacceptable pressure on residents, services, and utilities, and should not proceed until transport, infrastructure, and educational capacity are meaningfully upgraded to ensure sustainable development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	260	From:	Shane Cantillon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission outlines concerns at the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas from City Hinterland (ZO 20) to New Residential Neighbourhoods (ZO 2) in relation to planning policy, infrastructure capacity, environmental impacts, and the long-term needs of the local community.</p> <p>The submission states that the proposal should be assessed in the context of the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 (CCDP). The CCDP emphasises sustainable, plan-led development, supported by infrastructure, environmental protection, quality amenities, and balanced community growth. Both the RSES and CCDP promote compact growth principles,</p>			

and the protection of greenbelt lands. The submission argues that any rezoning of greenfield hinterland lands should clearly demonstrate alignment with these objectives, including proven infrastructure capacity, environmental sustainability, and the longterm interests of the community.

A key concern highlighted is that the proposed rezoning appears premature and development-led rather than infrastructure-led. The submission notes existing constraints in the area, including limited transport capacity, drainage and flooding issues, insufficient supporting infrastructure, and uncertainty regarding the cumulative impact of multiple developments in the area. It argues that existing zoned lands are not yet meeting housing delivery targets, making it difficult to justify additional greenfield rezoning.

The submission states that the proposal conflicts with compact growth principles by encouraging expansion into greenfield lands rather than prioritising brownfield and infill development.

Environmental concerns are raised, with the submission noting the greenfield site’s role in supporting biodiversity, maintaining ecological connectivity, managing surface water runoff, preserving visual amenity and dark sky conditions, and acting as a separation/natural screening between major infrastructure (such as the motorway) and residential areas. It highlights the absence of clear evidence demonstrating that environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated.

Flooding and drainage are identified as significant issues. The submission warns that additional development would increase surface water runoff, place pressure on existing drainage infrastructure, and increase the risk of downstream flooding impacts. The submission emphasises the absence of a robust drainage strategy within the proposed rezoning information, and the failure to assess cumulative impacts from nearby developments.

The submission notes that the proposal risks being seen as piecemeal site-led zoning and not part of a coordinated long-term planning framework, contrary to RSES guidance.

Existing local pressures in the area are detailed, including traffic congestion, inadequate road infrastructure, road subsidence issues, flooding and surface runoff issues, road safety, and a lack of green space and recreational amenities. In addition, elements of previous planning commitments for nearby developments (particularly relating to biodiversity and hedgerow retention) have not been fully delivered. The submission states that these pressures have not yet been fully assessed in light of recent and ongoing developments and would likely be exacerbated by further rezoning.

As an alternative, the submission proposes retaining the lands for sports and recreational use, highlighting the need for additional community amenities and green space. It emphasises the importance of nearby facilities such as Douglas Hall Football Club and suggests that preserving adjacent lands would support its continued operation and potential expansion.

The submission suggests that consideration of the lands’ future should be deferred until the next local area/development plan review c.2030, which would allow for comprehensive infrastructure assessment, cumulative impact evaluation, coordinated planning and community engagement.

In conclusion, the submission considers the proposed rezoning premature, unsupported by infrastructure, inconsistent with planning policy, and likely to worsen existing issues. It requests that the lands not be rezoned at this time and instead be retained for recreational use or assessed as part of a future, plan-led review process.

#### **Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Health &amp; Safety Authority (HSA)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission sets out that as the proposed zoning amendments do not apply to areas within the consultation distance of any Notified COMAH Establishment, the Health and Safety Authority have no comments to make in relation to Proposed Variation No. 3.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 9			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Lilian O’Gorman</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes Proposed Variation No. 3 which seeks to rezone Killeens (NW 1), arguing that Killeens is already experiencing development without the necessary supporting infrastructure. It highlights overloaded and outdated wastewater systems, frequent water outages and discolouration, and inadequate road safety for walkers, cyclists, and young people due to speeding traffic, lack of footpaths, cycle lanes, crossings, and insufficient signage. The submission notes unreliable bus services and the absence of bus shelters.</p> <p>It further states that promised childcare facilities have not been delivered, the local secondary school is oversubscribed, and the area lacks essential services such as shops, pharmacies, medical facilities, community spaces, sports amenities, and playgrounds. Concerns are also raised about protecting the rural character, landscape, and biodiversity of Killeens, which residents value and believe would be negatively affected by further rezoning.</p> <p>The submission concludes that no additional rezoning should proceed until critical infrastructure, safety measures, community and educational facilities, and environmental considerations are addressed for existing residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 30			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rachel Chegini</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Moneygourney, Douglas (SE 6), for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding traffic congestion on Carrigaline Road, Douglas Village, Maryborough Hill and Rochestown Road, the introduction of additional development without a clear plan to upgrade supporting infrastructure, and the submission raises cumulative impact of rezoning the land along with the development of other facilities in the area with the associated traffic impact.</li> <li>• A lack of clarity regarding investment in public transport, amenities, active travel infrastructure and road upgrades to support the rezoning of the site.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the perception of biodiversity in the area with suggestions submitted that the land may be better suited for green space, sports and recreational facilities.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	264	From:	Liam Strahan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore and calls for a comprehensive Area Development Plan to guide future growth. It argues that the area has a long-standing history of poor planning, referencing a 2015 UCC planning thesis (Pacelli Nolan), and contends that current proposals risk repeating these shortcomings. Concerns are also raised regarding recent planning processes, including a Part 8 scheme, where it is alleged that local services and amenities were overstated or inaccurately presented.</p> <p>The submission highlights a lack of transparency and coherence in the consultation process, stating that residents are being asked to engage without clear information on key infrastructure such as a relief road, school and childcare provision. It also points to inconsistencies in zoning, particularly the proposed loss of lands previously identified as public open space, and argues that the focus on SW1 and SW2 represents piecemeal rezoning without a holistic plan for the wider area. In addition, as one-off housing has previously been refused in the area, it is disproportionate that large developers would be favoured over individual citizens.</p> <p>Existing and planned developments (including over 900 new homes and a proposed school) will worsen already inadequate road capacity. Increased traffic, including rat-running through Lehenaghmore, will further restrict access and egress despite recent road improvements. Any environmental assessments used for recent developments are deemed unreliable due to blocked storm drains, meaning water flow and habitat impacts have not been properly measured. The council is urged to disregard previous site context information considered inaccurate, engage meaningfully with local residents, and develop a balanced plan that includes proper social infrastructure rather than densely packing housing, which could lead to long-term socio-economic problems.</p> <p>The submission concludes that further development should be paused until these issues are addressed, and calls on the Council to engage with locals and to prepare a structured plan to ensure that future growth in Lehenaghmore is properly planned and supported.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	265	From:	James D.
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes further zoning in Lehenaghmore due to inadequate infrastructure, worsening traffic, and the absence of a sustainable development plan. It notes that essential amenities such as a crèche, shop, GP, playground, and promised facilities have never been delivered. Concerns are raised about insufficient road capacity, lack of alternative routes, and the need for improved public transport and greenway links. The submission argues that significant investment is required before any additional housing is approved.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Terence Farrell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Lotabeg/New Inn, Glanmire (NE 4), designated as public open space for the North East Regional Park, to residential use, citing the following reasons: the rezoning would reduce the planned area of the North East park by around 30% and undermine its viability as a meaningful public amenity; the proposed rezoning conflicts with policies in the City Development Plan, risks weakening open space protections city-wide, and is a breach of public trust; it impacts on the equitable distribution of green space access and the lack of major parks in the north east, noting significant recent housing growth in the area; concerns regarding biodiversity and connectivity, climate regulation, and green infrastructure impacts, noting national and EU environmental obligations; loss of green belt buffer and visual amenity; and existing infrastructure deficits (e.g. traffic congestion and school capacity) in the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 27			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sharon Mullins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further residential rezoning in Lehenaghmore, stating that existing road infrastructure and public transport are already inadequate. It highlights severe daily traffic congestion, long-delayed road upgrades, and unreliable bus services. The submission argues that additional development could also restrict future transport solutions such as the Southern Distributor Road. It concludes that no further housing should proceed until road capacity, public transport, and school and community infrastructure are improved and long-term traffic solutions are secured.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Peter Kelly</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to rezoning land in Kerry Pike for new housing due to the lack of supporting infrastructure. It highlights the absence of shops, forcing residents to drive; the lack of a bus service, leading to increased car use and congestion; and roads that are unsuitable for current traffic levels. It also notes the absence of footpaths, creating safety risks for residents and children.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Janet Tynan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission opposes the proposed rezoning of land beside Millboro, noting that Kerry Pike has experienced significant development in recent years without corresponding upgrades to essential infrastructure. It highlights safety concerns due to heavy and fast-moving traffic, the absence of continuous footpaths or traffic-calming measures, and risks for schoolchildren. The submission also cites long morning delays, the lack of public transport, and the failure to deliver previously promised amenities such as a crèche and shop. It concludes that the village cannot sustain further population growth until basic infrastructure and services are provided.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Daragh OBoyle</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission acknowledges the wider need for housing but objects to the proposed development in Kerry Pike due to inadequate existing infrastructure. It highlights the absence of safe walking and cycling infrastructure, no public transport service, poor road conditions, and frequent water and electricity outages. It also notes that local schools lack capacity to support further population growth. The submission argues that additional housing would place unsustainable pressure on residents and essential services and requests that the application be refused until meaningful improvements to transport, utilities, roads, and school capacity are delivered.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ryan Creech</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the use of the roads in Crestfield in the rezoning of a new estate (NE 1), noting that the roads are not built for upwards of 500 more trips per day, and young children use the cul de sac as play areas.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Andrews Breslin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Moneygourney, Douglas from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhoods. It notes that quality housing for families is needed within the city, however it requests that development in the Moneygourney / Rochestown area be balanced with the delivery of public amenities for existing and future residents, including open spaces and playgrounds, community facilities, bicycle infrastructure. It is noted that facilities for youth groups are much needed, as they cannot			

expand due to lack of space in the existing facilities. The submission considers it an opportunity for the council to provide for a coherent, family friendly and linked up community by bringing community activities to the area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

Submission No.	273	From:	Ian O Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Lehenaghmore for further residential development, citing significant existing pressure on local infrastructure and services.</p> <p>It highlights deficiencies in roads, traffic, schools, healthcare, shops, recreation facilities, and community amenities, and argues that additional housing would exacerbate these issues. The submission considers further rezoning without prior infrastructure delivery to be inappropriate and unsustainable.</p> <p>The submission supports the preparation of an Urban Framework Plan to ensure proper planning, and requests that the proposed rezoning be removed until infrastructure and amenity deficits in the area are properly addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	274	From:	James Moore
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1) owing to the following issues. The proposed site is effectively landlocked; so traffic would have to be directed through existing residential estates on roads which were not designed for heavy use. The projected density of 560 homes is excessive and out of character with the area, will lead to increased traffic congestion, cause road safety risks, and impact residents' quality of life. The reliance on accessing the development via Hazelwood is concerning as this was not part of the originally granted permissions for those developments. Rezoning would remove important greenfield and landscape areas which contribute to the area's visual character and act as an important environmental buffer; rezoning a ZO 17 designated area would also set a damaging precedent for future encroachment on protected lands. Rezoning is premature until existing deficits in infrastructure are addressed (e.g. traffic, schools, drainage, healthcare, transport). Submission highlights that nearby low-lying land and watercourses need further assessment due to flood risk. Finally, the proposal conflicts with proper planning where brownfield or serviced land should be prioritised for rezoning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Caitlin Begley Moloney</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission strongly objects to proposed rezoning of land near Crestfield and Hazelwood estates. It notes that the area is struggling with a high volume of traffic which is a danger to all road users and that there have already been a number of road traffic incidents. There is also currently only one entry/exit road to Hazelwood estate, and the exit is becoming increasingly difficult to negotiate. Finally, the submission contends that community services are already stretched to capacity. In light of this, the submission considers proposed development is not feasible.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Carol O Keeffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of sites SW1 and SW2, citing concerns about flood risk from replacing grasslands with hard surfaces, increased noise and dust pollution, and the complete absence of public transport. It highlights the removal of trees and hedgerows as a significant biodiversity impact, along with expected traffic congestion and reduced privacy for existing residents. The submission also notes long-standing unmet commitments regarding local amenities and argues that no further development should proceed until adequate infrastructure and community facilities are delivered.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Shirley &amp; John Paul Khan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of Lehenaghmore SW1-SW2, stating that the development would significantly alter the area’s rural character, reduce privacy, and replace existing natural views with construction and housing. It notes long-term residents chose the location for its scenery, tranquillity, and wildlife, and argues that these qualities would be lost. The submission also raises concerns about the impact on local wildlife and the natural environment and concludes that the proposed development would fundamentally change the character of the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nikita Khan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to a proposed 700-unit housing development in Lehenaghmore, citing significant concerns about loss of privacy, the scale of the project, and its impact on the character of the area. It notes that the development would replace existing open views with a dense line of houses overlooking the property, reducing sunlight and affecting residential amenity.</p> <p>The submission highlights expected traffic congestion, increased noise, loss of green space and wildlife, and pressure on schools and GP services.</p> <p>It argues that the scale and height of the proposal are out of keeping with the area and would negatively affect quality of life for existing residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Susan Smith</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning and development of lands in Moneygourney. The proposal is considered detrimental to residential amenity through loss of privacy, light, and increased noise. Concerns are raised regarding traffic congestion, parking, and road safety. The proposal is considered incompatible with the existing character of the area due to its design and density, and considers that there are environmental risks, including flooding, drainage issues, and impacts on trees and wildlife. It is noted that existing infrastructure may be insufficient to support the development, in terms of sewage, water and road, and that the proposal may conflict with current County or Local Area Development Plan objectives.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Joelle O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to rezoning NE 1. It states concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, traffic safety (risks to children and pedestrians) and loss of green space and habitats.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	281	From:	Chantelle Khan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission formally objects to the proposed development at SW1 and SW2 Lehenaghmore, acknowledging the need for additional housing in Cork City but expressing serious concerns about the potential impacts on the local environment, traffic/road safety, and community wellbeing.</p> <p>The submission highlights the likely destruction that development in the area will cause of natural habitats currently supporting wildlife such as bats, deer, and foxes, as well as the negative effects on cattle grazing in the surrounding lands. The submission warns that continued loss of green space risks permanently altering the rural character of Lehenaghmore.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised regarding the impact on residential amenity, with the anticipated increase in traffic, noise, and public access, resulting in a loss of privacy and tranquillity. They further note that the scale and positioning of the development could reduce natural sunlight to their property, negatively affecting their quality of life.</p> <p>Traffic and road safety are identified as major issues, which would be exacerbated by further development in the absence of any road upgrades. The submission emphasises the dangers posed to pedestrians, particularly children, due to the area's existing road conditions and increased traffic volumes.</p> <p>The submission also highlights the potential negative effects on elderly residents, noting that increased traffic, noise, construction disruption and overdevelopment may cause significant stress for those who have lived in a quiet area for many years.</p> <p>In addition, the submission points out the existing lack of infrastructure and amenities in Lehenaghmore, including schools, healthcare services, shops, recreational facilities, and safe pedestrian routes. They argue that this has resulted in an unsustainable level of car dependency, and is contrary to the “15-Minute City” objective in the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028.</p> <p>Drawing on personal experience, the submission notes difficulties in securing housing locally despite long-term residence in the area, ultimately resulting in relocation. This is evidence of failures in achieving planned, balanced sustainable communities.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	282	From:	Brian Cotter
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike on the basis that existing infrastructure cannot support additional housing. It cites regular water and electricity outages and states that local roads require major upgrades before any further development is considered. The submission concludes that the area cannot accommodate more population or traffic without significant improvements.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	283	From:	Eric O Sullivan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning in Lehenaghmore, raising the following concerns.</p> <p>The prolonged noise, vibration, and heavy traffic from construction would disrupt residents over several years. There is no clear Construction Management Plan to manage these impacts.</p> <p>Loss of Privacy resulting from the proposed development overlooking submitter’s property from the upper floors and elevated positions of new dwellings. The proximity and density of new development would negatively affect residential amenity. No mitigation/screening measures have been proposed.</p> <p>New development would increase traffic volumes which would worsen congestion on the roads and create road safety hazards. Insufficient parking provision would displace vehicles onto nearby streets and worsen parking difficulties. The Transport Assessment inadequately models the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p>Local infrastructure (schools, healthcare, utilities, services and public transport) is already under pressure and may not cope with the additional demand. Submission urges the Council to require a comprehensive Infrastructure Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The development would result in loss of valuable green space, habitat and biodiversity, while the loss of trees, hedgerows and natural vegetation would reduce the area’s ability to absorb rainfall, provide shade and support wildlife. Also the Environmental Impact Assessment appears inadequate.</p> <p>The development’s scale, density and proximity could reduce neighbouring property desirability and amenity, with resultant negative effect on property values.</p> <p>The largescale construction will increase surface water runoff, heightening flood risks. The drainage strategy lacks assurance that drainage systems can accommodate an increased volume. With SuDS being implemented, concern that development may increase flood risk downstream.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	284	From:	Donal Dennehy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further residential development in Lehenaghmore, citing that infrastructure improvements have only recently commenced and are already overdue.</p> <p>It raises concerns that the road network is already overburdened, that current upgrades will not adequately address traffic capacity issues, and that further development would exacerbate existing pressures.</p> <p>The submission argues that the area requires additional infrastructure and amenities and suggests that the lands should instead be used for public open space and community facilities rather than further housing.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	285	From:	Shane Scott
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict with planning policy, the rezoning is inconsistent with the Cork City Development Plan and undermines the spatial strategy for Glanmire, which prioritises controlled, sequential development and protection of sensitive lands</li> <li>• Loss of landscape and amenity: The site contributes to the visual character and identity of the area, and rezoning would damage landscape quality and local amenity.</li> <li>• Infrastructure deficiencies, existing wastewater, water supply, drainage, transport, and active travel infrastructure are inadequate to support additional development.</li> <li>• Traffic and safety concerns, the local road network is unsuitable for increased traffic, and the proposal lacks adequate mitigation for congestion and pedestrian safety risks.</li> <li>• Flood risk, there is insufficient evidence to show the rezoning would not increase flood risk, with no detailed flood assessment provided.</li> <li>• Biodiversity impacts, the proposal lacks proper ecological assessment and may negatively affect habitats and protected species.</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts and precedent, rezoning could encourage further development of peripheral lands, leading to overdevelopment and strain on services.</li> <li>• Pressure on community services, increased population would place additional demand on schools, healthcare, and community facilities, with no clear provision identified.</li> <li>• Prematurity, the rezoning is considered premature without a coordinated masterplan and sufficient public consultation.</li> <li>• Lack of supporting evidence, the proposal is seen as speculative, with insufficient site-specific technical studies demonstrating its suitability for development.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	286	From:	John Collins
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the rezoning of lands near Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates, Glanmire for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on the established community: The estates are long-established, quiet cul-de-sac neighbourhoods with a strong sense of safety and community. Rezoning would disrupt this character and reduce safe play areas for children, particularly if new through roads are introduced.</li> <li>• Traffic and road safety concerns, the existing roads are narrow, congested, and not designed for additional traffic. On-street parking already limits access, creating safety issues for pedestrians and wheelchair users, while congestion at key junctions is already severe.</li> <li>• Loss of green space and biodiversity, the lands currently provide valuable green space and wildlife habitat, including sightings of protected red squirrels and buzzards. The development of these lands would result in habitat loss and environmental damage.</li> <li>• Flooding and drainage concerns, any development must not undermine the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme and should maintain greenfield runoff rates. There is concern this has not been adequately addressed.</li> <li>• Previous traffic surveys (July 2021) may not reflect normal conditions due to COVID-19 and school holidays, raising reliability and accuracy concerns.</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning and access issues, reference is made to past Ministerial Direction decisions, where lands were dezoned due to lack of proper access, suggesting similar concerns may apply here. The lands could instead provide community infrastructure such as schools, parks, or playgrounds.</li> </ul> <p>The submission concludes and calls for the rezoning to be rejected and existing zoning protections to remain in place.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b></p>
<p>See Response Ref. 24</p>

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>James Broderick</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning and development of approximately 700 residential units in Lehenaghmore, citing concerns about infrastructure capacity and sustainability, and that the proposal does not adequately demonstrate how the following issues would be resolved.</p> <p>Road infrastructure issues: The existing road network is already congested, constrained, with suboptimal layout, and the development would significantly increase traffic, creating longer travel times, safety risks, and further strain on roads.</p> <p>Insufficient sewerage/utilities capacity: Concerns are raised about wastewater and utility systems, which may be unable to accommodate the development, potentially leading to overloading of wastewater systems, system failures or environmental contamination, and service reliability issues.</p> <p>Lack of supporting amenities/services: The area does not currently have adequate schools, childcare, healthcare, public transport, or recreational/community facilities to support a large population increase.</p> <p>Unsustainable planning approach, the proposal is seen as premature and poorly phased, with infrastructure not in place or guaranteed before development.</p> <p>Impact on existing community, the development could lead to overburdened services, reduced quality of life, and loss of local character.</p> <p>The submission calls for the proposal to be rejected or deferred until a coordinated, sustainable development plan is in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Alan Donovan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Moneygourney due to a lack of supporting infrastructure particularly in regard to traffic management, footpaths, speed calming measures, street lighting and proposed volumes of foul, storm and water required for the increased volume of proposed units. The submission raises concerns that the rezoning does not consider any recreational and green space amenities in the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>AnnMarie Whelan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of 270 hectares for residential development in Lehenaghmore, citing existing traffic congestion with delays of up to 20 minutes on local hills and knock-on impacts in Togher. The submissions questions how more traffic can be added to an area with existing congestion.</p> <p>It notes the absence of bus services, limited footpath provision, and no meaningful infrastructure improvements in recent years. The submission highlights ongoing roadworks expected to continue until 2027 and states that no resident consultation was carried out.</p> <p>Additional concerns from proposed rezoning include surface-water and drainage risks and potential chemical pollution.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Valerie Duggan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed 700-unit development in Lehenaghmore, citing inadequate infrastructure capacity, including water, wastewater, schools, and medical services.</p> <p>It raises significant traffic and road safety concerns, noting existing congestion and the likely addition of over 1,000 cars.</p> <p>The submission highlights wildlife and biodiversity impacts due to habitat loss and removal of green space. It also argues that the scale of the proposal constitutes overdevelopment and would negatively affect residential amenity through loss of privacy, increased noise, and reduced quality of life. The submission concludes that the proposal is unsustainable and should be refused.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mark Pierce</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission is strongly of the opinion that a full assessment of the services, recreational facilities, transport etc needs to be undertaken before the green belt area north of the junction between Maryborough Hill and Garryduff Road towards Carrigaline is rezoned. The area is under pressure with extreme traffic. Submission urges the Council to defer decision until full consultation and assessment is undertaken.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	292	From:	Michael Murphy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission raises concerns about rezoning farmland in Lehenaghmore, Togher, for housing, noting that the area has already experienced extensive residential development without supporting infrastructure. It highlights that there are no local facilities such as shops, preschools, cafés, restaurants, or even a bus route, and that traffic impacts have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>Further concerns relate to the loss of green areas and the increased risk of flooding, as existing fields and ditches currently help absorb rainwater.</p> <p>The submission calls for engagement with local residents before major decisions are made that will significantly affect the community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	293	From:	Michael Hanrahan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>In its current form, the submission considers the proposed rezoning in Moneygourney to be premature as it is not supported by sufficient infrastructure and therefore is likely to exacerbate existing local issues such as traffic congestion, flooding risk, biodiversity and environmental concerns, particularly in relation to the further removal of mature trees. It would be development-led zoning of a greenfield site that is in conflict with compact growth principles when the cumulative impact of recent and permitted developments has not yet been fully assessed and where the delivery of housing on existing zoned land is not meeting targets. The submitter requests that the land be zoned for a community use such as for sports and recreational use, or that the decision is deferred until the next area plan in 2030, where a more sustainable, plan-led approach can be taken.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	294	From:	Tríona Kennedy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission raises concerns about the proposed rezoning at Lehenaghmore, noting the land had previously been identified as public open space and that nearby Affordable Housing units remain unoccupied. Transport and traffic issues are highlighted, including the unreliability of the 203 bus, lack of service from the 214, and already severe congestion. The absence of footpaths forces school drop-offs by car. The road improvement scheme is not expected to ease traffic and may worsen flow due to new traffic lights at Forge Hill. It is also noted that no school-term traffic survey was carried out. Further concerns relate to road capacity, increased commute times, mental wellbeing, and carbon emissions.</p> <p>Additional points are made about overdevelopment and loss of green space. The scale of the proposed housing is considered excessive, and Lehenaghmore Park remains inaccessible despite further housing being planned without supporting amenities.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Shane Coakley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission opposes rezoning proposal NE 1. It highlights safety concerns, particularly for children, due to construction traffic passing through the estate. In the past construction caused significant dust, noise, and disruption, affecting quality of life and air quality. Existing infrastructure issues remain unresolved, including unfinished roads and traffic congestion. Rezoning would reduce valuable green space, harm wildlife, and go against sustainable development principles. Additional housing would worsen pressure on childcare, traffic, and local services.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Joyce</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to any further rezoning in the Kerry Pike area until essential infrastructure is delivered, noting that the village lacks safe pedestrian routes, has hazardous junctions, and suffers from significant traffic congestion due to commuter rat-running and recent population growth. The existing roads are described as narrow, poorly maintained, lacking traffic-calming measures, and unsafe for both drivers and pedestrians, with insufficient footpaths and crossings. The submission argues that addressing these infrastructural deficits is necessary not only for safety but also to support effective public transport, and that only once these issues are resolved should additional development be considered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Paddy Buttimer</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission supports further housing at the top of Maryborough Hill but highlights the lack of supporting amenities. It notes that thousands of houses have been built since the 2000s, but that no new shops, cafés, restaurants, or similar facilities have been added since the 1990s, resulting in an area of people almost fully dependant on cars. Submission asks planners to include amenities including shops and recreational facilities as part of future housing developments in the area to reduce car dependency.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cathy Griffin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1) on the following grounds:</p>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rezoning to residential use would result in the loss of greenfield land, negatively impacting biodiversity, natural habitats, and the visual amenity of the area.</li> <li>• Lack of evidence that existing infrastructure (road networks, public transport, drainage, schools and healthcare services) could support a significant increase in residential development. The area already experiences traffic congestion, and further development would exacerbate this.</li> <li>• Potential flood risks (given the area’s proximity to the river, surrounding low-lying lands and previous flooding) which development could increase both on-site and downstream.</li> <li>• In the absence of a comprehensive masterplan for the wider area, including transport upgrades and community infrastructure, rezoning appears premature and piecemeal.</li> <li>• Proposed development would place additional pressure on existing residential areas, potentially affecting quality of life through increased traffic, noise, and strain on local services.</li> <li>• The rezoning conflicts with the principles of sustainable development, particularly the protection of green belts and the prioritisation of brownfield or infill development over greenfield expansion.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>
See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ian McGrath</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to rezoning of NE 1 for several reasons: Rezoning agricultural or undeveloped land may threaten wildlife corridors and landscape character contrary to Cork City Development Plan objectives; Infrastructure should be delivered alongside housing (e.g. schools, healthcare, childcare, public transport, wastewater, parks, community facilities); Existing traffic congestion and inadequate road capacity in Glanmire, and road infrastructure which may be incapable of accommodating new development. Concerns regarding school traffic, commuting bottlenecks, and emergency vehicle access.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Fitzgerald</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the rezoning of land at Moneygourney, Douglas. The submission raises concerns about the potential effects on wildlife and biodiversity and notes that previous developments have deviated from original plans to protect biodiversity and wildlife. The submission outlines that the area is unsafe for children to walk, cycle or meet due to traffic and the speed of cars. It is submitted that there is a lack of community green space, and it is suggested that a portion of the site be used for the nearby soccer club, for a country park or rewilded and it is considered that dereliction in Ireland should be addressed before further greenfield development. The submission notes that the local school is oversubscribed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	301	From:	Murtagh Murphy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission expresses concern that the proposed development in Moneygourney will worsen already severe morning traffic congestion. It notes long delays on the route to the N28 and argues that additional traffic, even with multiple access points and the future M28, will not be adequately accommodated. Submission also notes that there are not enough facilities for young people and that recreational facilities will be further reduced if Douglas Hall Soccer Club is redeveloped. Submission highlights a lack of hospitality options between the development and Douglas. This development will create a huge residential area south of Douglas with not enough facilities for young people.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	302	From:	Trudy Cantillon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges housing need and emphasises the need for sustainable, infrastructure-led development. It is argued that the rezoning of the site in Moneygourney is premature, as adequate transport, drainage, and community infrastructure have not yet been demonstrated.</p> <p>Concerns are expressed regarding deficits in road capacity, public transport, and drainage, and it is recommended that rezoning be dependent on a clear Infrastructure Delivery Strategy. The need for walkable communities is highlighted, with cycling and pedestrian links required to reduce car dependency.</p> <p>The lands are recognised as a green buffer, and it is proposed that significant areas be retained for recreation and community use, including sports facilities. Environmental concerns, particularly flooding, are noted, with a requirement for robust mitigation measures before development.</p> <p>It is emphasised that development should align with compact growth policies by prioritising existing urban sites. In conclusion, a balanced approach is advocated, where sustainable neighbourhoods with protected green space are delivered rather than housing alone.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	303	From:	Shaun Wiseman
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of Lehenaghmore (Site Specific Objective 4) based on lived experience of existing pressures in the area. The submission raises serious concerns about flooding and subsidence risks, warning that further development could cause structural damage to homes and financial hardship for residents. Concern that if development goes ahead in spite of these risks, the outcomes would be borne by residents with no support from the Council. In addition, no hydrological modelling, runoff assessment, or subsidence risk evaluation has been provided, which is a fundamental gap. There is a significant shortage of childcare and pressure on local primary schools, which would worsen</p>			

with additional housing. The traffic congestion is already severe, the current road improvements have not resolved the issue, and no credible traffic management/mitigation plan has been presented. Community infrastructure is inadequate, with insufficient parks, community facilities, healthcare, and usable open space. The submission requests the rezoning is removed, or at minimum, that strict conditions are imposed, including environmental studies, infrastructure planning, and guaranteed delivery of essential services before any development proceeds.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	304	From:	Cian Conway
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission regarding proposed rezoning of lands in Moneygourney from a local resident. Submission highlights that the current road infrastructure is already struggling to cope with existing traffic volumes, and increasing this will cause huge congestion in Douglas. It questions what plans are in place for a LUAS connection from Carrigaline and raises concerns about Cork Port’s ability to maintain Port 1 status if rail links are needed in the future. It asks whether the council is safeguarding land for future public transport infrastructure. In addition, the submission highlights the lack of amenities in Rochestown, calling on the council to ensure that development includes not only housing but also adequate community infrastructure in the interests of existing and future residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	305	From:	Shane Ryan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission appreciates the need for additional housing but opposes the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike owing to the lack of services and infrastructure in the area, e.g. no bus service, shop or childcare, and there are frequent water and electricity outages. Submission concludes that the Infrastructure should be improved before further housing is developed in the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	306	From:	John O’Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission expresses concern about the proposed rezoning of the land at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1). The area is struggling with high traffic volumes, roads that are unsuitable for the current volume of traffic, lack of capacity in general infrastructure and insufficient social amenities for the existing population. The submission raises concerns about traffic using the existing Hazelwood and Crestfield estate roads to access the new development, noting that while amendments to the junction layout of Hazelwood Road and R639 are generally welcomed, they have resulted in significant delays for traffic trying to exit from the Hazelwood			

estate on to the Hazelwood Road. These delays will increase significantly should access to the proposed rezoned land be via the Hazelwood and Crestfield estate roads.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rory Hanrahan</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to lands at the former Bessborough Mother and Baby Home. It provides a detailed historical background of the Bessborough Mother and Baby Home (Sacred Heart Home), sets out the planning history and planning policy (City Development Plan) context for the site, refers to Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage Circular NRUP 05/2022, and raises a number of issues.

The submission outlines the existing zoning framework noting that lands are currently affected by two land-use zoning objectives, “ZO 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods” and “ZO 17 Landscape Preservation Zones (SE 4 \*)”, with objectives relating to landscape protection, historic landscape reinstatement and limited development potential. The submission emphasises the site’s architectural, archaeological, historical, and social significance, including its designation as a National Monument, its listing on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage, and the presence of associated heritage features and landscape assets.

The submission highlights the findings of the Commission of Investigation into Mother and Baby Homes and Certain Related Matters, particularly as they relate to Bessborough, referencing the Commission’s conclusion that it is likely that some of the unaccounted burials may be located within the wider site, and that uncertainty remains regarding the exact locations of these burials.

The submission refers to Circular NRUP 05/2022, which sets out *inter alia* that “planning authorities ensure that locations where there may be evidence of unrecorded burial sites, are preserved and protected through the development plan review or variation process, to both enable public consultation and to allow for further investigation and any subsequent action that may be required”. The submission notes that previous variations of the City Development Plan did not address this requirement.

The submission requests that lands associated with the former Bessborough Mother and Baby Home that are currently zoned ZO 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods be rezoned and included in the ZO 17 Landscape Preservation Zones (SE 4) land-use zoning objective, and that the text to the SE 4 objective be amended to include “that it is an objective of to preserve these lands and preclude from development until the presence of unrecorded burials can be identified or ruled out”.

The submission raises concerns regarding the potential for future development to disturb or impact possible unrecorded burial sites, stating that the City Development Plan needs to be varied to rezone these lands to explicitly recognise this risk and to incorporate provisions that reflect the possibility of burials on the site. The submission also emphasises the potential negative impacts that any disturbance of such burials could have on survivors, families, and the wider community.

(\* in this submission response “SE 4” relates to the “Landscape Preservation Zone SE 4” objective as set out in Table 6.9 of the City Development Plan)

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 43

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ann Marie Mullins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike, citing the following issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It raises concerns regarding the cumulative impact of recent residential developments which the village’s infrastructure was not designed to absorb.</li> <li>• Lack of public transport leaving residents dependant on private cars, and pressure on the local road network, particularly at peak hours.</li> <li>• Limited school capacity in Clogheen Kerry Pike National School. Rezoning is premature without a plan for expanding school capacity.</li> <li>• Absence of safe pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, which has been previously raised as an issue, but is still unresolved.</li> <li>• The original Kerry Pike LAP sought to limit new dwellings to no more than 30 in the 2017-2023 period to preserve the village’s character and scale. Further zoning is inconsistent with these objectives.</li> <li>• The submission highlights the lack of investment in infrastructure despite ongoing development and th3e consequent collection of development levies.</li> </ul> <p>The submission requests that the rezoning be removed or that no further development proceed until a comprehensive infrastructure audit is completed and necessary upgrades are delivered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Michael Russell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>In reference to “Vol 1 Chapter 6: Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure; Open Space &amp; Biodiversity”, this submission expresses concerns over the lack of green areas, park style walks, and playgrounds.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 73			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eva Murphy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed development of 700 residential units at Lehenaghmore, while acknowledging the need for additional housing.</p> <p>It raises concerns regarding inadequate infrastructure, including water and wastewater capacity and pressure on schools and medical services, significant traffic congestion and road safety issues, impacts on wildlife and biodiversity, and the scale of development affecting residential amenity.</p> <p>The submission requests that the proposed rezoning not proceed on the basis that it is unsustainable and would place excessive strain on the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Joe Melvin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1, but requests that, if lands are rezoned, there is an explicit prohibition on vehicular access via Crestfield or Hazelwood estates. Key issues raised include traffic and safety, unsuitable estate access, infrastructure deficits, amenity and character impacts, service shortfalls, and loss of green space. The evidence cited relies primarily on para. 10.286 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which already identifies significant infrastructure needs in Glanmire, alongside observed congestion and the design limitations of existing estate roads.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rachel Sheedy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro at Kerry Pike, citing significant recent residential growth without corresponding infrastructure improvements. It raises concerns regarding traffic congestion, inadequate road network, lack of pedestrian infrastructure and safety measures, and absence of public transport, and argues that further development would be unsustainable and unsafe.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Deirdre Hourihan Healy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission highlights the following issues: no infrastructure, no creche, shops, bus service, constant water outage, and none of the services promised with other developments have been fulfilled.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eimear Foley</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to proposed rezoning at Sallybrook, Glanmire of NE 1 and further submits that significant development should only proceed after infrastructure has been provided. Concerns include negative impacts on existing communities (safety concerns, xx), local infrastructure (including schools, healthcare, childcare, recreation, sports), environmental protection (loss of mature trees, hedgerows, stone boundaries, and habitats, buffer zone for river and flooding, visual character and amenity value of this area), and public safety (including children and pedestrians).</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Anthony Healy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to any further development in Kerry Pike due to the poor planning in previous projects. Contends that roads and infrastructure were never upgraded, there is no bus route, no local shop or GP, and a promised crèche was never delivered. They also note that footpaths were built that lead nowhere.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Mairead Cummins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the rezoning of NE1 based on the proposed routing of an access road to the new estate through Hazelwood and Crestfield. A key concern is the increase in traffic in an already congested area, with roads that are unsuitable for high volume traffic, with sharp bends being a feature. Introducing through-traffic would increase congestion and road safety concerns particularly for pedestrians and children living in the estate. Adequate infrastructure needs to be put in place. Using a quick easy option that will lead to traffic issues, pollution and increased health & safety issues is not appropriate.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Amy O’Keeffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to rezoning lands near Barrett’s Farm and Wolfe’s Lane in Lehenaghmore for large-scale housing, noting proposals for up to 700 new homes.			
The submission argues this would worsen traffic congestion across Togher, Wilton and Airport Hill without a long-term area plan.			
They state that no impact surveys were carried out for existing residents and that communities in Lehenaghmore, Matthew Hill, Manor Farm, Ashbrook Heights, Alderbrook, Fernwood and Doughcloyne could face flooding, drainage problems, dust and chemical pollution during construction.			
They argue the area has faced years of development without matching infrastructure, and that current road works still fall short.			
They highlight the absence of local amenities such as shops, schools, medical services, pharmacies, playgrounds and sports facilities. They oppose any further rezoning until an urban framework plan is completed, stating residents have been repeatedly let down by planners and politicians.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Paudie Lucey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to proposed rezoning behind Millboro in Kerry Pike, citing a lack of essential infrastructure. The submission highlights insufficient childcare, no bus connections, limited amenities, frequent power cuts, water-supply issues, poor road surfaces, traffic congestion, and a lack of footpaths. They argue that no further rezoning is feasible until these problems are addressed.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Diarmaid Beecher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE1, citing as the primary concern the proposal to route access for the new development through the existing Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates. These estates were designed as quiet residential area and were never intended to function as through-roads for a large additional housing development. The roads are narrow, contain numerous cul-de-sacs, have limited footpaths in place and already experience significant traffic during peak times. Any substantial increase in vehicle numbers would create serious safety concerns for residents, particularly children who regularly use the green areas and roads within the estates.			
There are also major concerns regarding traffic congestion and road infrastructure which has not kept pace with development (e.g. the Hazelwood junction and surrounding roads). Routing further traffic through existing estates would worsen congestion, increase journey times, and create additional risks for pedestrians and cyclists. Submission also expresses concern that the proposals route access through existing estates without demonstrating that the existing infrastructure can safely accommodate such expansion.			
In addition, removing this valuable green space would negatively impact biodiversity and an amenity enjoyed by residents.			
Submission recognises the need for additional housing but contends that development must be properly planned with appropriate infrastructure, road capacity, public services, and amenities. Existing residents should not be expected to absorb the negative consequences of inadequate infrastructure planning.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jaime Jordan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission recognises the broader societal requirement for housing but objects to the access to proposed rezoning site being routed through upper Hazelwood & Crestfield residential estates. Also notes that the area is already at capacity.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Rhian Fitzgerald</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, highlighting the following issues: there are regular water and electricity shortages; there are minimal footpaths and bike lanes with little available space for them to be put in; there are few, if any amenities to cope with the increase in population, e.g. nursery or local shop; and finally, Morgan’s Hill is completely unsuited to current weight of traffic and is too narrow at present for cycle/footpaths.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eoin Quinlan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning at Kerry Pike on several key grounds.			
Firstly, they argue that the proposal conflicts with the Cork County Development Plan 2022–2028 which set a 10% growth cap for Kerry Pike due to known deficiencies in water supply, road capacity, and general services infrastructure. These infrastructure issues remain unresolved, while the area has already exceeded the permitted growth limit by approximately 117%. Submission contends that approving further development would exacerbate existing pressures and undermine the credibility of the Development Plan.			
Secondly, the submission highlights serious pedestrian safety concerns. The village road carries a high volume of traffic, including heavy goods vehicles, often travelling at unsafe speeds. The limited and narrow footpath provides inadequate protection, particularly for schoolchildren. The current conditions are described as dangerous, with a high risk of a serious or fatal accident. Additional housing would increase footfall and traffic, further worsening safety risks.			
Finally, the submission points to the lack of a bus service to Kerry Pike. Although a proposed bus route exists, the submission describes it as impractical and unlikely to reduce traffic. The route would require multiple bus transfers and significantly increase travel time for short distances, making it unattractive compared to driving. As a result, the proposal does not adequately address transport needs and is unlikely to lessen car dependency in the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Niamh Johnston</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike, highlighting that there has been significant residential growth in the area in recent years but that this has not been matched by investment in infrastructure and public services, thereby negatively affecting residents and raising major concerns about the sustainability of continued housing development.			
The submission notes that the local road network is under significant strain with severe traffic congestion and inadequate road conditions, noting increased commuting times owing to congestion, bottlenecks and road capacity. It also raises concerns about insufficient public			

transport, arguing that limited frequency, inadequate routes and poor connectivity force continued reliance on private cars.

It draws attention to overcapacity in schools with insufficient planning for education capacity alongside development. The same applies to wider community infrastructure, recreational facilities, childcare provision and local services.

In addition, it identifies deficiencies in water and electricity infrastructure, noting reliability issues and questioning the ability of existing systems to support further development.

The submission emphasises the lack of community and recreational amenities in the area, which have not kept pace with development, and contends that current development patterns risk undermining quality of life.

The submission calls on the Council to defer further rezoning or increased density until infrastructure is upgraded.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	324	From:	Liam Muldoon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission does not oppose housing but considers the rezoning of NW 3 Kerry Pike premature due to insufficient infrastructure, including roads, public transport, walking and cycling facilities, utilities, school capacity and local services.</p> <p>It argues the site does not meet key assessment criteria and highlights existing safety issues, congestion and limited connectivity, along with unimplemented public transport plans. Concerns are also raised about pressure on schools and utilities.</p> <p>The submission seeks removal or deferral of the rezoning unless infrastructure is delivered in advance or secured through binding conditions. If it proceeds, stronger requirements for infrastructure delivery and a buffer with lower-density transition to existing homes are requested.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	325	From:	Aoife Cregan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning at Lehenaghmore, citing inadequate existing infrastructure. It highlights concerns regarding traffic congestion, lack of public transport, insufficient footpaths, limited school and amenity provision, flooding issues, environmental impacts, and loss of green space, and states that further development should not proceed until these issues are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Chloe Higgins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike, while acknowledging the need for additional housing.</p> <p>It raises concerns regarding inadequate infrastructure capacity, including traffic congestion, poor road safety, lack of public transport, and insufficient pedestrian and cycling facilities. It also highlights issues relating to unsustainable urban sprawl, lack of supporting services and community facilities, environmental and landscape impacts, and absence of demonstrated infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>The submission argues that the proposal is premature and inconsistent with sustainable development and compact growth principles, and requests that the rezoning be refused in favour of prioritising infrastructure-led development and the use of brownfield and serviced lands.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin Wallace</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns in relation to routing traffic from the proposed NE 1 development through Crestfield estate, citing the existing narrow estate roads, and the constriction on dual-flow traffic owing to parked cars. Increased traffic will also lead to safety issues within the estate, especially as children play on the one green area in the estate which is beside the main estate artery road. In addition, with the new road layout onto Hazelwood, Hazelwood residents currently have to negotiate a blind bend coming from the Supervalu side as well as crossing the new cycle lane which has resulted in significant traffic backlogs.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ian Johnston</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns regarding proposed rezoning of land in Kerry Pike, noting that recent residential growth has not been matched by supporting infrastructure. It highlights issues including traffic congestion, poor road conditions, inadequate public transport, pressure on school and childcare capacity, strain on water and electricity services, and a lack of community and recreational facilities, and argues that further development should be delayed until these deficiencies are addressed through an infrastructure-led approach.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Caroline Radford</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the 8-acre site behind Millboro, citing concerns that Kerry Pike has already experienced significant housing growth without adequate supporting infrastructure. It highlights issues including traffic congestion, lack of pedestrian facilities, absence of public transport, and pressures on water and electricity infrastructure, and states that further development should not proceed until these services are reviewed and upgraded.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Don Cummins</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1, and expresses concern about using the Hazelwood/Crestfield Downs area as an access point for a new nearby estate. It notes that the volume of traffic in the estate is already at very high levels, and the existing road infrastructure would not be able to handle the increased traffic. The submission states that it is a quiet estate and a place where children play outside on the green, and they would have serious concerns about the safety of residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>David Sawbridge</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission raises concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike, citing a lack of local amenities and inadequate transport infrastructure. It highlights safety and capacity issues on key local roads, existing traffic congestion, and physical constraints limiting road improvements, and suggests that future development should be directed to alternative locations with more suitable infrastructure in place.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Eric Kelleher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, while recognising the need for additional housing.			
It highlights long-standing infrastructure deficiencies, including severe traffic congestion, lack of public transport, inadequate road network, limited school capacity, insufficient footpaths, lack of local and medical services, and recurring utility outages, and argues that further development would exacerbate existing pressures and safety concerns.			

The submission requests that no further land be rezoned until these issues are addressed and calls for greater engagement with the local community before any additional development proceeds.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Marian Eiffe</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed development of approximately 700 residential units at Lehenaghmore, while recognising the need for additional housing.

It raises concerns regarding the scale of the proposal, traffic congestion and road safety, inadequate infrastructure and lack of local services, limited public transport capacity, impacts on the environment and character of the area, and considers the zoning to be premature.

The submission requests refusal of the application or, alternatively, a significant reduction in scale with infrastructure improvements required prior to development.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Beth McCarthy</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission from a resident of the Glashaboy estates, objecting to proposed rezoning of NE1 for the following reasons. Concern that any new development would be accessed through the existing estate, resulting in increased traffic volumes and increased construction traffic, leading to road safety concerns for pedestrians and children, and changing the character of a quiet area. Concerns regarding a loss of residential amenity as a result of potential overlooking, loss of privacy, increased noise and disturbance, loss of openness and green outlook, and the cumulative impact of intensified development. Finally, the submission states that the existing Glashaboy estates were developed as low-density residential neighbourhoods with a particular character and scale. Rezoning risks overdevelopment without the supporting infrastructure, road upgrades and community facilities. The submission requests these issues be addressed before any further development.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Alex Glennon</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike, while recognising the need for additional housing. It raises concerns regarding severe traffic congestion, lack of public transport, inadequate pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, poor road safety, limited school and childcare provision, including concerns regarding the delivery and viability of

proposed childcare facilities, absence of local services, recurring utility outages, and impacts on woodland and biodiversity, and argues that further development would place unsustainable strain on the area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Devlin</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Moneygourney (SE 2), seeing it as an inadequate response by the Council to meet national housing targets. The following issues are identified:

- Lack of consultation with residents in the area who are already badly affected by other housing developments.
- The number of houses that can be built as a result of the proposed rezoning is significant.
- There are no apparent plans to improve the supporting infrastructure to cope with such a large increase in housing in the area, e.g. footpaths, public transport
- There are no apparent plans for building more shopping centres (existing centres in Douglas are at capacity), and developing more schools, churches, medical facilities, etc
- Consideration does not appear to have been given to road access and traffic build up in an area which is already congested.
- Consideration should also be given to the retention of green public spaces and recreational areas.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Shirley Devlin</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Objection to the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney (SE 2) for the following reasons:

- It is unsafe to walk along roads in the area, even without a new housing development, owing to the speed of traffic. Residents only feel safe to walk at certain times which is very restrictive. Morning and early afternoon are not safe for walkers.
- Douglas is extremely busy; there is no parking in the shopping centres any day during the week with the volume of people and cars.
- Schools, churches and medical facilities are at capacity even without a new housing development.
- Traffic congestion means residents have to leave increasingly early in the morning to get to work or school.
- Green spaces must be retained for the growing community of young people.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jamie Boland</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission wishes to object to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Glashaboy Heights, Hazelwood, and Crestfield, citing the following concerns. The proposal removes protected greenfield land without adequate justification, leading to loss of green space, wildlife habitats, and natural landscape. The development would increase traffic congestion and pose road safety risks, especially during school times. Existing estates were not designed to become access routes for large new developments. Increased pressure on already limited infrastructure, including roads, drainage, schools, and local amenities. There are concerns about flooding and surface water runoff due to loss of permeable land. The development would harm the character of the area, creating a concrete jungle. Safety and quality of life for residents would be reduced, particularly during construction. The main concern highlighted is the surrounding areas are not built to handle excessive traffic and would create a serious risk to children in the area. Overall, while housing is needed, this location is unsuitable for a project of this scale.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Derville Allen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission acknowledges the need for additional housing however objects to the proposed rezoning of land in Moneygourney, Douglas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site form part of a vital greenbelt on the edge of the city</li> <li>• The proposed rezoning is not supported by existing infrastructure, and is inconsistent with local/regional planning policy.</li> <li>• There is limited transport capacity due to ongoing expansion; traffic congestion; ongoing drainage/flooding issues; and road subsidence issues on Moneygourney Road.</li> <li>• Rezoning even a portion of the land for sports and recreational use would be a better alternative and would have a positive impact on the quality of life for the Douglas community.</li> <li>• It is outlined that a more appropriate approach would to be consider the rezoning as part of the review of the next local area planning process around 2030.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Darragh Sexton</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning in Kerry Pike, stating that it is not aligned with the level of infrastructure required to support additional development. It highlights deficiencies in essential services, public transport, footpath provision, and existing traffic congestion</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	341	From:	Cathal Timoney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to Proposed Variation No. 3 while recognising the need for additional housing and compact growth.</p> <p>It raises concerns that development is proceeding ahead of infrastructure delivery, highlighting issues including traffic congestion, inadequate road capacity and safety, lack of public transport, poor pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, and insufficient community services. The submission argues that current infrastructure is already under strain and that further expansion would be unsustainable.</p> <p>The submission requests that the variation be rejected or revised, and that an infrastructure-led approach be adopted, including comprehensive traffic and road safety assessments, with transport, public transport, active travel, and community facilities delivered prior to further rezoning or residential development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	342	From:	Cara Morris
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed development at Kerry Pike, while recognising the need for additional housing. It raises concerns regarding inadequate infrastructure, including lack of footpaths and cycle lanes, absence of public transport, unsafe road conditions, recurring utility outages, and limited school and childcare capacity, and requests that the proposal be refused until these issues are addressed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	343	From:	Deirdre Hughes
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the scale of development in newly zoned area in Moneygourney. Highlights the key concern as morning traffic, noting that during school term it can take up to 30 minutes to get onto South Link. There is already a shortage of recreational facilities for young people. Moneygourney Road will need a major upgrade with lighting, footpaths etc. The Douglas/Rochestown area is growing significantly but without any extra social facilities (e.g. restaurants/pubs) and Rochestown Inn is closing.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Margaret Kelleher</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to further large-scale rezoning in Kerry Pike, stating that it should not proceed until necessary supporting infrastructure is delivered. It highlights issues including lack of public transport, absence of safe footpaths and cycle lanes, dangerous road conditions, traffic congestion, and lack of local services, and argues that existing pressures must be addressed to ensure sustainable development for current and future residents.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Leanne Power</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to rezoning of lands at Sallybrook, Glanmire (NE 1) on the basis that: there is no plan to upgrade infrastructure, especially the road network, to support additional housing; routing traffic through existing estates will result in congestion and pose road safety risks; an existing lack of facilities, particularly schools and creches, with no plan to accommodate additional residents; the removal of greenfield land would negatively impact the natural character and biodiversity of the area; increased flooding risk in the Glashaboy River catchment; and the impact on residents' quality of life owing to increased traffic and density. In conclusion, the submission states that the proposal is not supported by adequate infrastructure and is not in line with sustainable planning principles, and zoning should be deferred until proper infrastructure, services, and assessments are in place.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Annette O’Brien</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of land at Kerry Pike, stating that local infrastructure has not kept pace with recent population growth.			
The submission highlights ongoing issues including power and water outages, poor road conditions, lack of pedestrian connectivity, absence of public transport, limited school capacity, and a shortage of childcare facilities.			
It contends that additional housing would place further strain on an already overburdened area and should not proceed without significant infrastructure improvements.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Victoria Borisova</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas. Highlights that the neighbourhood is in strong need of a recreational area, extended sport facilities and pedestrian paths. Also notes that current infrastructure, heavy traffic and lack of adequate public transportation will not accommodate an extensive residential development.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sarah O’Keeffe</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at SW 1 and SW 2 Lehenaghmore, stating that it is premature and not supported by adequate infrastructure.			
It raises concerns regarding traffic congestion, limited public transport, lack of essential services and community facilities, and increased flood risk arising from the loss of natural drainage on greenfield lands. The submission also highlights potential impacts on residential amenity and biodiversity, noting the loss of habitats and mature vegetation.			
It further argues that the proposal is inconsistent with National Planning Framework principles, which require infrastructure-led development and the protection of environmental assets, and would place significant pressure on the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Robert Mackey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike, citing poor infrastructure, lack of services, absence of public transport, and ongoing traffic congestion.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Alisha Heffernan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the Sallybrook site (NE1), arguing that the proposal would effectively connect a number of housing estates, creating a large, landlocked housing area which would create a traffic funnel through estates which already have a high traffic volume, thereby increasing traffic through existing estates, raising safety concerns and negatively impacting quality of life. Submission highlights that similar concerns were previously raised without adequate resolution. The submission also criticises creating a high-density area without the supporting infrastructure, including schools, childcare, and recreational amenities. A lack of recreational facilities can also contribute to anti-social			

behaviour, particularly among younger residents. In addition, public transport is insufficient, with infrequent and often overcrowded bus services, which further development would exacerbate, leading to reliance on private cars and compounding traffic and environmental concerns. The Submission urges the Council to reconsider the proposal unless adequate infrastructure is provided.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	351	From:	Brian Cahill
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission expresses concern regarding proposed development in the area (NE 1). The submission highlights that ongoing roadworks are already inconvenient, with no clear completion timeline. The submission notes that the proposed development site had previously been deemed unsuitable, with no explanation provided as to why the current proposal differs from earlier rejected plans. Along with neighbours, concern is expressed about the impact on local infrastructure, especially primary schools, which are already oversubscribed. The submission stresses that essential services such as schools, childcare, and community facilities should be established before any new housing developments proceed. Concerns are also raised about the potential increase in antisocial behaviour if a new through-road is introduced within the estate, as well as the risk of increased traffic using the area as a shortcut, posing safety dangers to residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	352	From:	Breda O Connor
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission opposes the proposed rezoning lands near Millboro for residential development. While acknowledging the need for additional housing, it argues that recent growth in Kerry Pike has not been matched by necessary infrastructure improvements. Key concerns include traffic congestion, narrow road networks unable to accommodate current volumes, and the lack of public transport, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. The submission also highlights deficiencies in essential services such as schools, childcare, retail provision and bus connectivity.</p> <p>The submission further raises concerns regarding road safety and infrastructure capacity, noting issues such as speeding, inadequate footpaths and unsafe crossings, alongside recurring water and electricity disruptions. It contends that these shortcomings demonstrate that existing infrastructure is not capable of supporting further development.</p> <p>While not opposing housing in principle, the submission concludes that further rezoning should be deferred until essential infrastructure and services are reviewed and upgraded to support sustainable growth.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brian Falvey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike, while acknowledging the need for additional housing. It highlights a lack of supporting infrastructure, including poor road conditions, no footpaths or public transport, limited school capacity, insufficient childcare, and recurring utility outages, and states that further housing would place additional strain on the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Deirdre Sexton</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission objects to the proposed rezoning under Objective 16 at Kerry Pike, citing significant deficiencies in infrastructure, services and capacity to support further development. It highlights ongoing traffic congestion, lack of public transport, inadequate road network and pedestrian safety concerns, as well as recurring water and electricity outages.			
The submission also raises concerns regarding the non-delivery of previously proposed amenities, including childcare, retail and community services, and notes that existing residents are already experiencing the impacts of growth without adequate supporting infrastructure. It concludes that further rezoning should not proceed until substantial improvements are made to infrastructure, utilities and local services.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brian Stuart</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission contends that new housing in the Moneygourney green belt will negatively impact traffic and local people’s quality of life.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Dia Silverstein</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission concerned about the proposed re-zoning of the large green area to the back of Douglas Hall Soccer Club in Moneygourney (SSO1). If this large area is permitted to become residential it will likely lead to multiple other green field sites adjacent being developed and the green spaces lost. There are other developments underway in the area already (at the back of Maryborough Ridge) and planning has been granted for other sites in that area.			

Should this large plot be rezoned and houses built, Douglas AFC will not be able to expand in future as planned.

In addition, there are capacity issues that arise should such a large area suddenly include hundreds of houses, specifically regarding road safety, school capacity in the area, water/sewage/electric capacity, and traffic congestion.

Submission questions the reason for rezoning when the land was already designated a Green Belt in the City Development Plan and not due for review until 2029. Submission considers this an ill-considered, knee-jerk reaction to a housing crisis which does not properly consider long-term effects and whether this site and the locality is appropriate for high density development.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>James Allen</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission opposes rezoning of lands at Moneygourney, Douglas. The need for increased housing supply is acknowledged, however the proposal is considered premature, lacking in necessary infrastructure, and inconsistent with key statutory local, regional and national planning frameworks and guidelines.

Concern is expressed that the proposal conflicts with Cork City Development Plan objectives and claims that required provisions such as road upgrades, school capacity, public transport improvements, and community facilities have not been identified. It is stated that the site is car-dependent and poorly served by public transport, thereby undermining objectives relating to compact growth, sustainable transport, and climate targets. Concerns are raised regarding the absence of ecological assessment, including biodiversity protection and green infrastructure requirements. In addition, it is stated that known flood risks have not been adequately assessed.

It is submitted that the proposal does not align with national or regional objectives, as it does not support compact growth, prioritise sustainable mobility, or include appropriate environmental assessments and the “infrastructure first” principle has not been followed.

In relation to the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (2009), it is alleged that requirements have not been met, regarding school capacity, transport accessibility, community infrastructure, or environmental considerations.

It is also noted that the proposal is not supported by evidence-based planning. No Traffic Impact Assessment, school capacity analysis, public transport strategy, or Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken, despite existing congestion, school oversubscription, and infrastructure pressures in Douglas.

It is concluded that the rezoning would result in unsustainable, car-dependent development, increased congestion, pressure on public services, potential flood risk exposure, and conflict with climate objectives. On this basis, the proposal is considered premature and contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

Accordingly, it is requested that the proposed rezoning be rejected until comprehensive infrastructure, transport, educational, environmental, and flood risk assessments are completed, and full compliance with statutory planning frameworks is demonstrated.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 18

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission strongly objects to further residential development in Kerry Pike, citing existing congestion, lack of public transport, and incomplete footpath infrastructure. It also raises concerns regarding the ongoing lack of promised amenities and perceived underinvestment in the area.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Yvonne O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission regarding the proposed housing in Lehenaghmore/Mathew Hill area. The submission highlights that there is already substantial disruption over the past year or in the Lehenaghmore/Mathew Hill area, especially with traffic, and if more residential housing is developed, they question how will the increased traffic be accommodated? The submission notes that it is hard enough trying to get down Lehenaghmore Hill in the mornings with the traffic at the moment so it will be chaos adding more cars to this, together with more disruption with roadworks and traffic lights for another few years.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Orlaith Lane</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission from a resident of Glashaboy View objecting to the NE 1 rezoning on the following grounds. Construction activity will result in air and noise pollution over several years, which is particularly an issue for younger children whose formative years will be spent beside a building site. The narrow road through Glashaboy estate would not be suitable for the volume of HGVs/cars/vans, and the extra traffic represents a safety risk for children. Heavy traffic in Glanmire would be exacerbated and add to air pollution. Existing services, including crèches, are already constrained, and additional services are needed to support the population growth resulting from the construction of 1000 further houses near Glanmire in Dunkettle and expansion of existing estates. Construction excavation works, and removal of vegetation and soil may potentially cause cracking and subsidence of nearby properties. In conclusion, the submission believes development would negatively affect residents' quality of life.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Frances Hedigan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission objects to rezoning NE 1 on the grounds that the site is not suited to high-density development for It submits that the site is environmentally, visually, and socially			

important and specifically: states concerns of potential flood risk caused by decreased permeability in the area associated with development, as well as water quality and drainage concerns; submits that existing infrastructure (schools, GPs, childcare, drainage, transport, rec & amenity) is already under strain and that no plan is in place to ensure infrastructure to serve additional development is concurrently provided; notes specific transport issues noting impacts on amenity and safety (i.e. existing traffic congestion in the surrounding area, concerns that the existing streets have insufficient capacity, lack of pedestrian facilities on the private road to the west of the site and impacts the lack of facilities/increased footfall are already having); cites biodiversity concerns, noting new development's impacts on loss of habitat, increased light pollution, and emissions and referencing the Natura Impact Statement prepared as part of the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme; submits that the proposed site is the most elevated land in the area and that it contributes significantly to the landscape character and amenity of the area; and the importance of retaining arable land for food production. Submits that re-use of brownfield lands should be prioritised, including re-development of some former mills along the Glashaboy.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	362	From:	Mark O'Hanlon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NE 1. It specifically notes: that existing congestion significant and additional traffic from new development is expected to intensify delays; construction impacts including noise, dust and safety risks; concerns that existing estate roads are not suitable for increased traffic and could have safety impacts for pedestrians, cyclists, and particularly children; cites negative amenity impacts on character of existing estate caused by traffic, noise, and disruption; negative impacts on landscape character of Glanmire; negative impacts on environment due to loss of greenfield; and lack of social infrastructure capacity (e.g., roads, schools, healthcare).</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	363	From:	Fiona Condon
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of green belt lands at Sallybrook for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The red line boundary with the proposed rezoning is inaccurate</li> <li>• Flood Risk: The land absorbs rainfall and helps manage surface water in an already flood-prone area. Development could worsen flooding despite ongoing relief works.</li> <li>• Inadequate Infrastructure: Local schools, healthcare, childcare, transport, sports and recreational facilities are already overstretched. Previous development proposals were rejected due to unresolved access and infrastructure issues, which still persist.</li> <li>• Environmental Impact: The site supports important wildlife (including bats, otters, and red squirrels) and is close to sensitive river systems. Development would permanently damage biodiversity and ecological balance.</li> </ul>			

- Loss of Landscape Character and Amenity: Rezoning would destroy a valued green space and natural buffer, negatively affecting residents’ quality of life. Planned access roads could also increase noise, air, and light pollution near homes.
- Traffic and Safety Issues: Local roads are already congested and unsuitable for increased traffic. Additional development would worsen road safety risks and place pressure on unsuitable private access routes.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Brid Harrington</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission expresses concern about the further rezoning in Kerry Pike. Highlights that there is an insufficient road structure to deal with the volume of traffic at peak times. Also notes that it is very dangerous to try to cycle at rush hour, there’s no provision for cycling in the village, and no street lighting for a significant portion of the journey towards the city. The bus route is non-existent, so these issues need to be addressed before further rezoning is to be considered.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>John Danter</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission opposes the proposed rezoning and further residential development in Kerry Pike, expressing frustration among residents at the continued failure to deliver promised infrastructure and services. It highlights concerns that developers have not provided agreed amenities such as crèches and shops, and alleges a lack of enforcement by the Council in ensuring compliance with planning conditions.

The submission also raises significant infrastructure and safety issues, including heavily trafficked roads, lack of footpaths, and ongoing problems with water supply, broadband capacity and general servicing. It emphasises that the area is already under strain and contends that further development would exacerbate existing deficiencies, concluding that no additional housing should proceed in advance of meaningful infrastructure delivery.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Bridgewater Homes</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission made on behalf of Bridgewater Homes relates to 12.6ha of greenfield lands at Bellevue Road, Frankfield, which are currently zoned “ZO 20 Hinterland”. The submission states that Bridgewater Homes Ltd has the capability to commence and complete a residential development at Bellevue, Grange within the short term. The submission contends that the site presents a significant opportunity for a sustainable and cohesive extension to the surrounding urban neighbourhood. The site is well serviced and benefits from a range of

<p>amenities in the immediate area, supporting the seamless integration of residential development at this location.</p> <p>The submission supports the site’s rezoning to “ZO 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods” on the basis that the lands are serviced and demonstrably deliverable for residential growth to 2030 in accordance with the stated purpose and criteria for the inclusion of sites associated with the relevant Section 28 Guidelines. Reference is also made to an assessment by the submitter of lands proposed under the variation regarding the extent of meaningfully deliverable lands, which it is proposed justifies the reassessment and inclusion of the subject lands.</p>
<p><b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b></p>
<p>See Response Ref. 44</p>

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Orla Rutherford</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission raises concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of lands in Kerry Pike for additional housing, acknowledging the need for new homes but emphasising a significant deficit in supporting infrastructure. It highlights the absence of continuous footpaths, cycle routes, and public transport, resulting in a reliance on cars despite the area’s proximity to Cork City. The submission also notes deficiencies in local services, including the lack of childcare facilities, limited school capacity, and absence of local retail amenities.</p> <p>The submission concludes that Kerry Pike lacks the infrastructure necessary to support further development and calls for a comprehensive infrastructure plan to be put in place prior to any rezoning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Chloe Murphy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic and Access:</b> The local road network is already under severe strain and was not designed for current traffic levels. Congestion is particularly problematic during school hours. Additional housing would significantly worsen traffic conditions, especially around Hazelwood and Crestfield Estates and at the Hazelwood Road junction, which is already congested and has become more dangerous following recent changes. Increased traffic would also heighten noise levels and pose safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and children.</li> <li>• <b>Environmental Impact:</b> The proposed rezoning would lead to the loss of greenfield land and natural open space, negatively affecting biodiversity, local amenities, and the overall character of the area.</li> <li>• <b>Pressure on Infrastructure:</b> Routing new developments through existing estates would place undue pressure on infrastructure that is already inadequate, and lead to safety concerns for residents.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Joelle O’Connell</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Upper Hazelwood / Crestfield for residential development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inadequate Infrastructure:</b> Existing infrastructure such as roads, drainage, schools, healthcare, childcare, and public amenities are already under significant pressure and cannot support further large-scale development without clear, funded upgrades.</li> <li>• <b>Traffic and Road Safety:</b> The development would increase traffic through residential streets not designed for high volumes, creating congestion, noise, and serious safety risks for pedestrians, children, cyclists, and emergency access.</li> <li>• <b>Environmental Impact:</b> The land provides valuable green space and wildlife habitat. Development would lead to loss of biodiversity, reduced natural drainage, increased flood risk, and diminished environmental and visual amenity.</li> <li>• <b>Impact on Residential Character:</b> The proposal would alter the established character and scale of the area, reducing overall quality of life due to increased density, traffic, and loss of green space.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Nashs Boreen Residents Committee</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NW 5, noting that the lands comprise an existing but currently unused playing pitch. It emphasises that the GAA Club forms a significant part of the Fairhill community and its recreational infrastructure states that rezoning any portion of the club grounds would undermine the club’s operational viability and limit its ability to maintain, improve, or expand its facilities in the future.</p> <p>The submission highlights that this is a RAPID area, and that northside RAPID communities already experience a documented shortage of accessible recreational space. It states that the loss of these lands would disproportionately affect residents who depend on local, walkable amenities.</p> <p>The submission contends that the rezoning proposal is contrary to national policy and to the City Development Plan. It references national policy objectives supporting the protection and enhancement of sporting and recreational facilities as essential to participation, public health, and community wellbeing, and cites Chapter 12 of the Development Plan in relation to open space. It further argues that the proposal has not demonstrated compliance with the sequential, brownfield first approach to zoning set out in Chapter 12 and in the National Planning Framework (NPF) Implementation Guidelines, and requests that alternative brownfield or infill sites be identified instead. It also states that the proposal contravenes Chapter 6, which seeks to protect, enhance, and manage the Green and Blue Infrastructure network, and that no replacement open space has been identified to offset the loss.</p> <p>The submission states that infrastructure capacity has not been demonstrated, noting existing constraints in the street network and transport system, and requests that infrastructure assessments be published prior to any rezoning.</p>			

Finally, it submits that the Strategic Environmental Assessment does not adequately address community and social impacts, and requests direct engagement with the club and the wider community before any future rezoning proposals are brought forward.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 33

Submission No.	371	From:	Mark McGloughlin
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission relates to the proposed rezoning of lands at Killeens (Zoning Ref. NW 1) from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhoods. The observer raises serious concerns about the suitability of the site for residential zoning at this time, particularly given existing infrastructure constraints and the potential reliance on established residential estates (Seanabothair and Lios Cara) for access.</p> <p>The primary issue relates to traffic and access. It is argued that Seanabothair and Lios Cara are local residential roads not designed to accommodate significant additional traffic or act as access routes for a new development. The submission highlights concerns regarding road safety, increased traffic volumes, risks to pedestrians and children, construction traffic impacts, and cumulative pressure on the wider road network. It requests that no rezoning proceed without a comprehensive Traffic and Transport Assessment and strongly objects to any access being provided through these estates.</p> <p>The submission also identifies deficiencies in infrastructure and services, including concerns around water supply capacity, wastewater infrastructure, and the absence of adequate local services such as shops, schools, healthcare and public transport. It is argued that Killeens functions as a low-service residential area and that further housing would increase car dependency and place unsustainable pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Additional concerns relate to residential amenity, public safety, and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Submission notes that rezoning could negatively affect the character of the area, increase noise and disturbance, and exacerbate existing issues such as antisocial behaviour. It is contended that the proposal fails to demonstrate how a sustainable, serviced neighbourhood would be achieved.</p> <p>The submission concludes that the rezoning is premature and should not proceed unless Cork City Council can clearly demonstrate that adequate infrastructure, safe access arrangements (not via existing estates), and supporting services can be delivered. Alternatively, if rezoning is advanced, the submission requests specific safeguards, including prohibition of access through Seanabothair and Lios Cara, detailed transport and infrastructure assessments, confirmed servicing capacity, and further consultation with residents at planning stage.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 30			

Submission No.	372	From:	Uisce Éireann
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Uisce Éireann welcomes the opportunity to comment on Proposed Variation No. 3 and notes that they provided Cork City Council with infrastructure assessments for some of the sites being proposed for zoning changes in advance of the publication of Proposed Variation No. 3.</p>			
<p><b>Availability of Water Services</b></p>			
<p>Uisce Éireann welcomes the revised Core Strategy Table 2.2A and Growth Strategy Table 2.3A as they rely on CDP population estimates for assessing future capacity available in each water resource zone and wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) for settlements. Uisce Éireann continuously monitors growth in settlements, and reviews available water supply and wastewater treatment capacities. Capacity Registers are published annually and the remaining capacity available changes regularly; the registers are only an indication of available capacity. The level of available capacity will need to be revisited should a significant increase in overall demand for water services be experienced in settlements. If required, Uisce Éireann can initiate projects to increase capacity, subject to funding in future Capital Investment Plans.</p>			
<p><b>Water Supply</b></p>			
<p>The submission notes that the latest Water Supply Capacity Register (April 2026) shows that there is currently capacity available with some level of service improvements required (e.g. leakage reduction or capital investment) in the Water Resource Zones serving settlements listed in the Core Strategy table. The submission notes further that the Water Resource Zones will come under increasing pressure should the total requirement of housing units be developed within the timeframe indicated (up to 2030).</p>			
<p><b>Wastewater Treatment</b></p>			
<p>The submission notes that the latest Wastewater Treatment Capacity Register (April 2026) generally shows that there is currently capacity available in the settlements listed in the Core Strategy. While Killeens WWTP currently has no capacity, a project is underway to increase capacity. Rosemount Kilkully WWTP has currently no capacity and no project identified.</p>			
<p><b>Water Networks</b></p>			
<p>Uisce Éireann and Cork City Council are continually progressing leakage reduction activities, mains rehabilitation activities and capital maintenance activities, and will continue to monitor the performance of the networks to ensure that the most urgent works are prioritised as required.</p>			
<p><b>Wastewater Networks</b></p>			
<p>Uisce Éireann and Cork City Council are continually progressing sewer rehabilitation activities, capital maintenance activities, etc., and will continue to monitor the performance of the networks to ensure that the most urgent works are prioritised as required. The submission highlights that under the recast Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (UWWTD) Uisce Éireann and local authorities will need to collaborate on integrated drainage planning.</p>			
<p><b>Zoning Maps</b></p>			
<p>Where Uisce Éireann assets are within a proposed development site these assets must be protected and / or diverted. For example, existing gravity sewers run through Sites <b>SE 4, SE 5, SE 7, SW 7, NE 2, NE 3</b> and <b>NE 7</b>, and existing water mains run through Sites <b>SE 2, SW 7, NE 1</b> and <b>NW 2</b>. Site layouts must take account of existing sewers and water main locations. If there is a possibility that Uisce Éireann assets will need to be altered or diverted as a result of a proposed development, a diversion agreement may be required.</p>			

The submission notes that the exact requirements to service a site will be determined through the Uisce Éireann connections process, and where network reinforcements are required, these shall be developer driven unless there are committed Uisce Éireann projects in place to progress such works.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 10

Submission No.	373	From:	Kevin Buckley
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning at Kerry Pike, arguing that essential infrastructure must be improved before further development. The area is already experiencing growth without corresponding public investment in infrastructure. Key concerns include frequent electricity and water outages due to increased demand poor road infrastructure which is unable to handle current traffic volumes and the lack of public transport. There is an absence of footpaths, limiting safe walking and cycling. There is insufficient capacity in the local primary school. Overall, the objection highlights that existing services and infrastructure are inadequate to support additional housing.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	374	From:	John Phelan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes more development in Lehenaghmore in the absence of supporting infrastructure and facilities.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	375	From:	O’Leary & O’Sullivan Developments Ltd
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission seeks the designation of lands at Clogheen (c.17.6ha) as Long Term Strategic Development Lands, rather than retaining their current City Hinterland zoning. The lands are located within the city boundary, adjacent to Hollyhill and the Apple campus.			
The key issue identified is a spatial and housing imbalance in Cork City, with insufficient land zoned for development in the north west compared to other areas, alongside a broader shortfall in housing supply despite strong demand in the northern suburbs.			
The submission requests that the lands be included as strategic development lands to help increase housing supply and support planned population growth targets. It argues that the site is well located to support compact growth, being close to employment centres and major planned infrastructure such as the Cork Northern Distributor Road.			
In justification, the submission asserts that the lands are considered suitable for transport oriented, serviced development, with capacity for c.600 units, and would contribute to more			

balanced city growth, support sustainable transport investment, and address the mismatch between housing provision and employment in the north west.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 45

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>International Investment ICAV Limited Partnership 1</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission seeks the rezoning of lands at Old Fort Road, Ballincollig from Town Centre to New Residential (ZO2), arguing that the site is strategically located within the built-up area, fully serviced, and capable of delivering housing in the short term. It also contends that the overall level of land proposed under Variation No. 3 overstates the amount of genuinely deliverable residential land, and that additional “ready-to-develop” sites such as this are required to help meet Cork City’s housing targets within the current Development Plan period.

Key issues raised include the claim that much of the land identified in the variation is either constrained, already developed, or designated for long-term growth, and therefore unlikely to contribute to immediate housing supply. The submission requests that the site be rezoned to enable residential development, emphasising its strong infrastructure capacity, proximity to services and public transport, and suitability for compact, transport-oriented development, while also seeking the inclusion of a specific objective to protect and enhance an existing biodiversity corridor.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 46

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>The Moloney Family</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission is a supporting representation to Proposed Variation No. 3 of the Cork City Development Plan, requesting that lands at Carrigrohane (c. 15.5 ha at Clash Road/Carriganarra Road) be retained and confirmed as “Long Term Strategic Development Lands” in the final adopted variation, on the basis that their location near the proposed Luas Cork route, existing services, and surrounding development make them suitable for future transport-oriented residential growth, helping to deliver housing and support integrated land use and transport planning in the Cork metropolitan area over the longer term.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 38

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Alan &amp; Norma Hyde</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission is seeking a rezoning of lands at Clogheen (c. 14.7 ha) as part of Variation No. 3, specifically requesting that Site A be zoned for “New Residential” (ZO2) to allow immediate housing development, while Site B is zoned as “Long-Term Strategic/Residential Reserve” (ZO3) for phased future development. In effect, the applicant is arguing that at least part of

the site should move from a rural/hinterland designation to active residential zoning now, rather than being left as long-term or undeveloped land.

The justification centres on the claim that the lands are ready and suitable for housing delivery, highlighting that they are serviced or easily serviceable, unconstrained, and located beside existing development, infrastructure, and employment areas, making them ideal for compact, transport-oriented growth. The submission also argues at a strategic level that Cork City is failing to meet its housing targets and that much of the currently zoned land is not delivering, so there is a need to prioritise “shovel-ready” sites like Clogheen that can contribute to short-term housing supply (500+ units) while still supporting longer-term growth objectives.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 47

Submission No.	379	From:	Rodrigo Araujo
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning and development at Kerry Pike due to significant deficiencies in essential infrastructure. Sewerage Infrastructure, there is no adequate public sewer system in place and existing individual systems are already under strain, raising concerns about environmental protection and public health. The development should not proceed without proper wastewater infrastructure. Pedestrian Safety, the area lacks continuous footpaths and safe pedestrian routes, creating safety risks, particularly for children and residents. Additional development would worsen these issues without prior improvements. There are concerns around the reliability and capacity of the existing electricity network, with reported outages. Further development could increase demand and risk further instability unless upgrades are made. Kerry Pike has already experienced significant growth without matching infrastructure investment, leading to congestion, service strain, and reduced quality of life. The proposal fails to adequately address this cumulative impact. Conclusion, the area is not equipped to support further development at present. The submission requests refusal or deferral unless key infrastructure (sewerage, pedestrian facilities, utilities) is delivered in advance, ensuring infrastructure-led approach to growth.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	380	From:	Byrne Creedon Development Consultancy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission welcomes the proposed zoning of NW 4, Milestream, Shanakiel, stating that this change to the current zoning arrangement by realigning the “ZO 1” boundary will safeguard the development potential of the lands and allow for the delivery of residential development in a sustainable manner in the future.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 32			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sonia Sunny</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further rezoning and development in Kerry Pike on the basis that infrastructure has not kept pace with recent housing growth, with the area already experiencing deficiencies in water supply, sewage services, road capacity, and school provision. The resident highlights ongoing issues such as water outages and significant traffic congestion at peak times, arguing that the existing network is insufficient to support additional population growth.</p> <p>It further raises concerns about road safety, noting the absence of effective traffic management, traffic calming, and pedestrian infrastructure, which creates risks for residents and particularly children. The submission emphasises the cumulative impact of multiple recent developments in Kerry Pike, combined with increasing through-traffic from nearby Tower and Blarney, and concludes that the community has reached capacity. It calls for a halt to further development until substantial infrastructure improvements are delivered, including better pedestrian facilities, traffic management, public transport, water services, childcare provision, and school capacity.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Creedon Group and MMD Construction</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission seeks the rezoning of approximately 5.3 hectares of lands at Lee Bank, Lee Road from City Hinterland to New Residential (ZO2), along with associated amendments to zoning objectives, to facilitate residential development within the current Development Plan period. It states that the site is located within the built-up area of the city, is serviceable in infrastructure terms, and could contribute to housing delivery in the short term, with the applicant indicating an intention to advance development if the rezoning is supported.</p> <p>The submission also raises broader issues regarding the overall effectiveness of lands identified in Variation No. 3, noting that some areas may be constrained, fragmented, or designated for longer-term development and therefore may not contribute to housing delivery within the plan period. In this context, it proposes the subject lands as a suitable location for residential development, citing their proximity to existing infrastructure, services and public transport, and their potential to support compact growth and contribute to the ongoing regeneration of the northwest suburbs.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 48			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Conor Burke</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands for residential development at Kerry Pike, arguing that further housing should not proceed until basic infrastructure is delivered. It highlights a long-standing failure to provide essential amenities,</p>			

particularly safe pedestrian infrastructure, noting the absence of footpaths and the dangers posed to residents moving through the village.

The submission emphasises that traffic volumes have increased significantly due to recent development, exacerbating safety risks, with vehicles travelling at high speeds through the village and minimal protective measures in place.

The submission also identifies a range of critical infrastructure deficits, including the need for a comprehensive footpath network, traffic calming measures, public transport, school capacity and transport services, and reliable water and electricity supply.

Additional concerns are raised regarding the condition of local roads, lack of delivery of developer-led infrastructure, and broader underinvestment in the area. It concludes that these are fundamental requirements that must be addressed immediately, and argues that continued development without such investment reflects ongoing neglect of the community and is unsustainable.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	384	From:	Jodie Donovan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission opposes the proposed zoning of Sallybrook/Hazelwood (NE 1), contending that infrastructure is already stretched to meet demand. The submission cites as examples: lack of adequate childcare which would be exacerbated by increased development; inefficient public transport, with only one bus passing Sallybrook per hour, known for its unreliability, and too far from Sallybrook for those with mobility issues; limited open spaces and recreational spaces; the flow through of traffic between the estates causing concern for families with children playing in the estate.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	385	From:	Southern Regional Assembly (SRA)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The Southern Regional Assembly acknowledges and supports the need for Cork City Council to provide for additional housing through this Variation process based on the Section 28 Guidelines – NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements. The submission notes that the Regional Assembly has recently commenced the review of the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region (RSES), and the revised RSES must align with the objectives of the National Planning Framework First Revision and will provide a basis for the future 10-year Development Plan cycle.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 2			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>JCD Group</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission supports the proposed rezoning of lands at Rathpeacon. It requests that the ZO 2 zoning objective and Site-Specific Objective 18 be retained in the final adopted Variation.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 35			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Paul Healy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
This submission, made by the landowner, responds to Proposed Variation No. 3 to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, which seeks to rezone lands (c. 9.8 ha) at SW10 from “City Hinterland / Long Term Strategic Land” to “ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods.”			
The submission outlines that the lands form part of an actively farmed family holding and states that the existing Long-Term Strategic Land zoning more accurately reflects the appropriate timeframe for any future development.			
It notes that Site Specific Objective 7 links development of the lands to the delivery of Phase 2 of the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor, which is not yet fully planned or permitted, and therefore argues that the lands are unlikely to be developable in the short term.			
The submission further refers to the Department’s “Residential Zoned Land Tax – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (December 2024), which recognise farming as a legitimate ongoing economic activity and acknowledge that landowners may not wish to pursue residential development immediately, even where lands are zoned. It highlights that the proposed rezoning came as a surprise, as the owner had been anticipating development in the longer term, potentially in the next Development Plan cycle.			
On this basis, the submission requests that the existing Long-Term Strategic Land zoning be retained, in line with the intent of the Guidelines, to allow time for appropriate planning and for the necessary transport infrastructure to be delivered. It is argued that retaining the current zoning would provide a more realistic and sustainable approach to the future development of the lands.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 23			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Development Applications Unit (DAU), Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The DAU raises a number of heritage-related concerns regarding Proposed Variation No. 3, relating primarily to deficiencies in supporting information, potential impacts on sensitive archaeological and architectural sites, and the prematurity of certain zoning proposals.			
The submissions notes that the Proposed Variation No. 3 <b>mapping</b> is poorly presented making it difficult in some cases to locate the sites affected (SW 10 and SW 11), and that Recorded Monuments and Places (RMPs) need to be mapped.			

**SW 9, Greenfields Road, Ballincollig (Ballincollig Castle)**

There is no objection in principle to this proposed rezoning, however concerns are raised regarding the cumulative visual impact of incremental development on Ballincollig Castle and Bawn Wall (Recorded Monuments and Protected Structure), and that while these monuments are not included in any rezoning proposals, ongoing piecemeal development is gradually eroding the monument’s historic setting and visual prominence. Cork City Council should consider drafting a masterplan for this area to ensure long-term protection of these monuments, their curtilage and siting.

The submission acknowledges that the accompanying zoning text in Site-Specific Objective 6 states that ‘the site will be subject to a full assessment of environmental constraints including a site-specific flood risk assessment’, but requests that additional text be included considering that Ballincollig Castle sits outside the site boundary:

*“The assessment of environmental constraints associated with this site shall include an archaeological and architectural assessment of any potential impacts on Ballincollig Castle. The contents of the architectural and archaeological assessments shall be set out by Cork City Councils Archaeologist and Architectural Conservation Officer.”*

**Long-Term Strategic Development Land, Site B, Church Hill, Carrigrohane**

This site is located within the curtilage of Carrigrohane Castle (Recorded Monument and Protected Structure), a significant site from an archaeological and architectural heritage perspective dating to the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and adjacent to St. Peter’s Church and graveyard (Protected Structure and Recorded Monuments), with potential for subsurface archaeology (including burials and earlier structures). The historic demesne landscape remains largely intact. The DAU raise concerns regarding the impacts of vehicular access to this site and potential conflicts with current City Development Plan policy and advise that the “rezoning” of this site is premature and should be excluded from Proposed Variation No. 3 pending further assessment. Consideration could be given to redistributing Site B’s development potential to alternative nearby sites (Sites A, C, and D) which appear to have fewer constraints.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 11

Submission No.	389	From:	Bridgewater Homes
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission requests that lands at Spur Hill are included in the final adopted Variation 3 to Cork City Development Plan 2022-28. The lands at Spur Hill meet all assessment criteria set by Cork City Council under Proposed Variation No. 3. They are considered a sustainable and serviceable location for residential growth, aligning with national and regional planning policies (NPF, Section 28 Guidelines, RSES, and the CDP 2022 – 2028). The site is well-positioned next to existing and developing residential areas and has access to infrastructure, services, and strong transport links. It can be delivered within the current Development Plan period and located in an area with proven housing demand. Overall, the lands are presented as an ideal short- to medium-term housing development opportunity in line with national planning objectives. Water supply networks are located directly to the east and north, while gas infrastructure serves the surrounding area. The site has direct access to water and wastewater services (including storm and foul drainage) through adjacent developments and local roads. Overall, the availability of existing infrastructure ensures that the lands can be efficiently serviced for development. The Spur Hill lands are presented as a highly sustainable, well-serviced, and strategically located site for residential development in Cork</p>			

City. They form a logical extension to the city’s South Environs development boundary. Overall, the submission positions the lands as an appropriate and timely opportunity for city expansion and housing delivery.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 49

Submission No.	390	From:	Breda O’Connor
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission opposes the proposed variation to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 in respect of the rezoning of lands near Millboro for residential development. While acknowledging the need for additional housing, it argues that Kerry Pike has already experienced significant growth in recent years without corresponding investment in infrastructure. Key concerns include traffic congestion, narrow road networks incapable of accommodating current volumes, and the absence of adequate public transport, pedestrian and cycling facilities. The submission also highlights deficiencies in essential community services, including schools, childcare provision, retail facilities and reliable bus services.</p> <p>The submission further emphasises road safety and infrastructure capacity issues, noting increased risks arising from speeding traffic, lack of footpaths and unsafe crossings, all of which are aggravated by ongoing development in surrounding areas. Concerns are also raised regarding the capacity of existing utilities, citing recurring water and electricity outages as evidence that infrastructure is not equipped to support further population growth. The submission concludes that further development should be deferred until infrastructure and essential services are reviewed and significantly upgraded to support sustainable growth.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	391	From:	Cllr Oliver Moran
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the lands at Kilcully off Rosemount Estate from ZO 15 Public Open Space to Z02 New Residential Neighbourhoods. It submits that there is significant risk due to location in a landslide-prone area, that the precautionary principle suggests avoiding development on such lands, and that, given the limited housing yield from the site, that sufficient alternative lands already zoned or proposed for housing in the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 26			

Submission No.	392	From:	Laura O’Keefe
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission from Hazelwood estate resident objecting to the proposal to route c.500 cars per day from the proposed estate through a residential area that already has significant volumes of daily traffic and a green area where children play adjacent to the proposed access point.</p>			

Submission requests that alternative options to this massive increase in traffic volume be found. The submission recommends first ensuring all vacant property in Glanmire is occupied before decimating more local trees, wildlife and greenery.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	393	From:	Alice Desmond
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission provides a strong objection to the proposed rezoning of additional lands at Kerry Pike (Site Specific Objective 16), primarily due to the scale of recent and projected population growth and the absence of supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>Submission states that data indicates that Kerry Pike has experienced the highest growth within the City Development Boundary, with a 117% increase from 2016 to 2022 and a projected 203% increase by 2030, far exceeding original Development Plan targets. This level of growth contrasts sharply with other areas that have seen reduced population targets despite having significantly better infrastructure, including public transport and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Concerns centre on the lack of corresponding investment in infrastructure to support this growth. The local road network is already at or beyond capacity, there is no safe pedestrian access through the village, and essential services such as water supply are under strain, with frequent outages reported.</p> <p>While there is recognition of the need for additional housing, it is emphasised that any rezoning should be contingent on the delivery of critical infrastructure, including improved road and pedestrian safety measures, public transport provision, childcare facilities, upgrades to water services, and community amenities, to ensure that development proceeds in a sustainable and safe manner.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	394	From:	Limerick City and County Council – N/M20 Project
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission supports Proposed Variation No. 3 but raises issues in relation to the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project (the Project), which will connect Cork and Limerick – Ireland’s second and third largest population and economic centres. In particular, reference is made to proposed zoning amendment NW 6 and associated Site-Specific Objective 17 (Ringwood, Blarney) regarding potential encroachment into the safeguarded N/M20 corridor and requests boundary amendments and strengthened policy wording to ensure that the delivery of this nationally significant infrastructure is not compromised.</p> <p>The submission sets out that the overarching objective of the Project is “to enable national and regional planning policies, particularly those supporting the National Strategic Outcomes of the National Planning Framework to promote balanced regional development, through enhanced population and economic growth”. This is to be achieved by adopting a holistic multi-modal approach to improving connectivity between the cities of Cork and Limerick, and</p>			

ultimately Galway, by: facilitating the safe and efficient movement of people, goods and services, reduced land transport journey times and improved journey time reliability.

The submission notes that Proposed Variation No. 3 must be framed in context of the First Revision NPF, which sets out the need for the promotion and effective management of regional growth, and emphasises rebalancing growth across the three Regions “with 75% of the growth to be outside of Dublin and its suburbs”.

In this context, the submission notes that the majority of newly proposed residentially zoned lands do not have a direct interaction with the published preferred option for the N/M20 scheme. One exception is noted: proposed zoning amendment **NW 6** and associated **Site-Specific Objective (SSO) 17** at Ringwood, Blarney. The submission references a conflict between the boundary of the proposed NW 6 amendment with the published Preferred Option for the N/M20 scheme. Reference is made to paragraph 4.136 of the City Development Plan which safeguards the N/M20 study corridor

The submission requests that the boundary of NW 6 be amended to exclude any development lands from the N/M20 scheme boundary. Further, the submissions requests that text to SSO 17 be updated to reference explicitly that any master planning of development on these lands should have regard to the design of and potential environmental interactions with the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project.

The submission states further that any further alterations to land use zonings that may arise as part of this statutory variation process do not impact ongoing design work or the planning and implementation phases for the N/M20 project.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 12

Submission No.	395	From:	Sarah O'Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission states that there is significant community concern regarding the proposed rezoning of the 8-acre site at Kerry Pike due to inadequate existing infrastructure. The area is already under considerable strain, with no public transport provision leading to a heavy dependence on private cars and resulting in ongoing traffic congestion on roads that are not designed for increased volumes.</p> <p>Basic road safety infrastructure is lacking, including footpaths, crossings, traffic calming, and adequate road markings, creating particular safety risks for families and children and limiting safe mobility within the area.</p> <p>In addition, concerns have been raised about the capacity and reliability of essential services such as water and electricity, alongside a perception that infrastructure delivery has not kept pace with recent development. While development contributions have been collected, there is little visible evidence of reinvestment to address these deficits.</p> <p>Although there is recognition of the need for housing, it is strongly emphasised that further development should only proceed in a planned and sustainable manner, supported by appropriate infrastructure, to avoid exacerbating existing safety, service, and amenity issues.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	396	From:	Evan Donovan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns about the proposed rezoning of lands at Hazelwood/Glashaboy, noting that significant residential development has already taken place without adequate supporting infrastructure. As a result, existing services and facilities, such as roads, schools, childcare, healthcare, public transport, and recreational spaces, are under increasing strain.</p> <p>Further rezoning would be premature until essential infrastructure is delivered and the cumulative impact of current developments is properly assessed. They emphasize that future growth should be guided by infrastructure provision and sustainable planning principles.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	397	From:	Comer Group
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Comer Group requests the consolidation and redistribution of educationally zoned land (ZO 12) on their landholding in City Docks to facilitate increased residential capacity (of approximately 250 additional units) aligned with Cork City Council’s ambition to achieve its revised housing growth targets under the Section 28 Guidelines on NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025). The submission questions the demand analysis undertaken by the Department of Education and Youth to inform the school demand.</p> <p>It suggests the proposed increase in the residential zoning on the Former Tedcastles site would allow for the delivery of a more efficient urban development and one which is not impacted by significant setbacks (20m) from the education boundary or challenged by a difficult zoning configuration.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 50			

Submission No.	398	From:	Coleman New Homes Limited
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission welcomes the proposal to remove the ZO 20 City Hinterland zoning objective from the 13.9ha lands at Arderrow, Ballyvolane. The northern 7.6ha portion of the lands is now proposed to be zoned ZO 03 Long-term Strategic Regeneration, and the 6.3ha southern portion ZO 15 Public Open Space.</p> <p>However, the submission considers that the 7.6ha lands do not have the attributes of Long Term Strategic Lands and that the maintenance of this objective will unnecessarily delay the immediate delivery of housing on the lands; similarly, the 6.3ha lands would better contribute towards the compact and sequential growth of Cork City’s northside and the realisation of housing in the near future.</p> <p>The submission seeks for them to instead be zoned “ZO 2 New Residential Development”. The submission considers that the proposed Variation presents a missed opportunity to zone</p>			

these lands which are in the ownership of an experienced housing developer and can accelerate the delivery of housing in Metropolitan Cork.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 28

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Judith Gahan</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to the site of an existing individual dwelling and its adjoining site to the east within a cluster of existing ribbon development on the Rathcooney Road within the overall Ballyvolane Strategic Growth Area.

This site, containing the existing dwelling house, is currently zoned “ZO 20 City Hinterland” and designated “Long Term Strategic Development Lands”, and is proposed to be zoned in Proposed Variation No. 3 as “ZO 3 Long Term Strategic Regeneration” as part of the NE 6 site.

This submission requests recognition and redesignation of the subject dwellinghouse site and adjacent site as an existing built up area to accurately reflect the extent of the built up area and to give effect to the proposed alterations to Chapter 3 in relation to the rural housing policy for the adjoining greenfield site which are relevant under the existing “ZO 20 Hinterland” zoning.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 51

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Horizons</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to specialised residential accommodation and highlights concerns regarding the rigid interpretation of Objective 11.8 “Older Persons and Specialist and Supported Living Accommodation”, particularly sub-sections (a) and (b) which seek specialised accommodation to have good access to mixed communities and local facilities. The submissions states that the nature of specialised accommodation makes this particularly challenging and requests the inclusion of additional text to Objective 11.8 to facilitate consideration of such accommodation within the City Hinterland subject to a justification test.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 77

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>The Horgan Family &amp; O’Flynn Construction (Cork) Unlimited Company</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission supports the proposed rezoning of lands at Kerry Pike for residential development, on the basis that the site is within the city development boundary, is serviceable, and represents a logical and sequential extension of the existing built-up area. It highlights the capacity of the lands to deliver new housing in the short term, supported by an active developer, and considers this aligned with national and local policy objectives for compact growth and increased housing supply.

Key points include the suitability of the site due to its location adjacent to existing residential development and services, its ability to integrate with the surrounding area, and its contribution to meeting housing demand and population targets.

The submission also seeks the removal or amendment of a proposed site-specific objective, arguing that it is unnecessarily restrictive and that the site should be permitted to proceed independently based on its own merits.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	402	From:	Gerard Tynan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns regarding the proposed variation on the basis that residential rezoning is being advanced in areas where infrastructure, services and community facilities have not kept pace with existing growth.</p> <p>It highlights that many suburban and edge-of-city communities in areas such as Killeens are already experiencing deficiencies in access to healthcare, education, transport, local services and recreational amenities, resulting in an overreliance on neighbouring areas and increased car dependency.</p> <p>The submission emphasises that this pattern risks reinforcing unsustainable “dormitory suburbs” that are inconsistent with national policy on compact, balanced and self-sustaining communities.</p> <p>Key issues include the lack of local employment opportunities, limited provision of community and social infrastructure, inadequate pedestrian accessibility, and deficits in green space and recreational facilities.</p> <p>The submission calls for an infrastructure-led approach to development, requesting that future rezoning and housing delivery be clearly linked to the provision of supporting infrastructure, services, and employment opportunities.</p> <p>It also seeks a stronger focus on integrated neighbourhood planning, including mixed-use centres, accessible transport and active travel infrastructure, and inclusive, age-friendly community facilities to ensure sustainable and well-functioning communities.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 74			

Submission No.	403	From:	Society of African Missions Trustees (SMA)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission welcomes this variation and zoning change for the lands at Spur Hill, Doughcloyne, Togher, and encourages the Council to adopt this variation without delay to allow the timely development of the lands. The inclusion of these lands within the settlement boundary and the residential zoning of the lands will allow the provision of new homes.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 22			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>O’Flynn Construction Limited</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission welcomes the proposed rezoning of part of their lands at Lauriston House, Lauriston Hill, to “ZO 03 Long Term Strategic Regeneration”, but notes that the full extent of their lands have not been included and are earmarked to remain “ZO 20 City Hinterland”.</p> <p>The submission contends that this is a missed opportunity for the consolidated and holistic development of the lands and their proper integration with the immediate area, to integrate with other zoned lands north and south, and in particular their capacity to enable a sustainable public transport and active travel connections at the southern part of the site where the lands interface with the preferred route of the Cork Northern Distributor Multi Modal Route (CNDMMR).</p> <p>Accordingly, the submission seeks the extension of the proposed “ZO 3” zoning objective across these lands to their southern boundary with the Old Youghal Road.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 29			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cormac McCarthy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning in the Lehenaghmore area on the basis that the existing road network is already under strain and cannot accommodate further housing without worsening traffic congestion and delays.</p> <p>It also highlights a lack of local amenities and community facilities, including recreational and social spaces, and notes the absence of all-weather play areas such as astro turf.</p> <p>The submission expresses concern that additional development is being proposed without adequate supporting infrastructure or facilities for residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Vicky O’Sullivan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at Barrett’s Farm and Wolfe’s Lane on the basis that the scale of proposed housing, potentially exceeding 700 units, would place significant additional pressure on an already constrained road network serving Togher, Wilton and Airport Hill. It highlights existing traffic congestion, inadequate road infrastructure, and limited public transport, and argues that current upgrades such as footpaths and cycle lanes are insufficient to address these underlying capacity and safety issues.</p> <p>It further raises concern that no comprehensive long-term plan has been prepared to manage the cumulative impacts of development in the area.</p>			

Key issues also include the lack of essential services and amenities to support both existing and future residents, including schools, healthcare, childcare, recreational facilities and local services.

The submission further highlights potential environmental and residential impacts such as flooding risk, surface water drainage issues, dust and pollution, and notes the absence of detailed impact assessments. It calls for a coordinated and integrated planning approach, including proper consideration of access, public transport, and community infrastructure, and requests that rezoning not proceed in advance of a comprehensive development framework that addresses infrastructure provision and community wellbeing.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	407	From:	Westbrook Housing Company Limited
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the rezoning of lands at Cooney’s Lane, Grange, for residential development in line with national and local planning policies as it aligns with key national and local policy objectives, including compact growth, sustainable transport, and the 15-minute city concept. It is noted that strong connectivity is supported through existing and planned transport infrastructure improvements, and that the proposal would support housing delivery and contribute to sustainable urban growth and a logical and sequential extension of the existing Cork City South Environs.</p> <p>The location of the site is within an existing residential area with access to services, amenities, employment centres, and public transport and it is stated that the lands are fully serviced and supported by existing and planned infrastructure, making them suitable for short-term housing delivery.</p> <p>It is considered that Cork City is experiencing a significant housing delivery shortfall and that current output is failing to meet established targets. In addition, concerns are expressed that a substantial proportion of already zoned land is constrained or unlikely to be delivered within the current plan period, reinforcing the need to prioritise serviced, unconstrained sites.</p> <p>The submission states that the Cooney’s Lane site is deliverable, with capacity for residential development at appropriate densities and no significant environmental, flood, or servicing constraints. The significant infrastructure investment by the public and private sector is noted, supporting pedestrian connectivity, traffic management and the overall carrying capacity of Cooney’s Lane, with capacity for additional residential development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 52			

Submission No.	408	From:	John Barrett
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission argues that the lands at Lehenaghmore are a highly suitable and sustainable location for new housing and should be fully rezoned as “New Residential Neighbourhoods” (ZO2). It emphasises that the site is well located on the edge of Cork City, close to established suburbs like Togher and Wilton, with strong access to roads, public transport, jobs, schools and services.</p>			

It also states that the lands are largely unconstrained, not subject to environmental or heritage restrictions, and can be serviced with water and wastewater infrastructure within the lifetime of the current development plan, making them capable of delivering housing in the short term.

The submission also makes a broader argument that Cork City does not have enough genuinely “deliverable” housing land despite the large headline figure of zoned lands in the draft plan.

It claims that a significant portion of those lands cannot realistically produce housing in the near term due to constraints, fragmentation or long-term zoning.

On that basis, it presents these lands as a key opportunity to help address the city’s housing shortfall by providing a substantial, ready-to-develop site, and concludes by urging the Council to include the entire landholding in the final rezoning to support housing delivery to 2030 and beyond.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	409	From:	Amy O'Brien
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>There are significant concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of lands at Killeens (Zoning Ref NW 1), particularly in relation to infrastructure capacity, access, and the cumulative impact on an already under-serviced area. The submission highlights that the local road network, especially Seanabothair and Lios Cara, is not designed to accommodate additional traffic, and using these residential estate roads as primary access routes would create serious road safety risks, increase congestion, and negatively affect pedestrian safety and residential amenity. There are also strong objections to any construction or through-traffic being routed through these estates, with concerns about a “rat run” effect and the impact on emergency and service vehicles.</p> <p>In addition, there are concerns about deficiencies in essential infrastructure and services, including water supply constraints, lack of public transport, and the absence of local amenities such as shops, schools, childcare, and community facilities. Residents emphasise that Killeens does not currently function as a sustainable neighbourhood and that further development would exacerbate car dependency, infrastructure strain, and public safety issues, including antisocial behaviour. It is considered that the rezoning is premature unless supported by clear evidence that infrastructure can accommodate growth.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is requested that the Council either refuse the proposed rezoning or, at a minimum, attach strict conditions.</p> <p>These include prohibiting primary access via Seanabothair and Lios Cara, requiring independent access solutions, and ensuring that comprehensive assessments are carried out in advance, including traffic and transport studies, road safety audits, infrastructure capacity confirmation (particularly from Uisce Éireann), and community and public safety evaluations.</p> <p>It is also requested that no development proceed until all necessary infrastructure upgrades and services are in place, and that safeguards be implemented to protect the amenity and safety of existing residents.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 30			

Submission No.	410	From:	Cllr Albert Deasy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission, made by an elected member on their own behalf and representing local residents, sets out strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (SW1 and SW2) for residential development.</p> <p>It argues that further large-scale housing in the area would be premature and unsustainable given the long-standing absence of essential social and community infrastructure.</p> <p>Residents, some living in the area for over twenty years, continue to lack basic services including local retail, healthcare, childcare, schools, recreational facilities, and community amenities.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised regarding the continued closure of Lehenaghmore Park and the area’s heavy reliance on car-based travel.</p> <p>The submission highlights significant deficiencies in transport and physical infrastructure, noting that the existing road network (particularly Togher/Pouladuff) is already operating beyond capacity, and current upgrade works do not provide additional capacity or address structural issues such as the lack of bus lanes, active travel routes, and new road connections.</p> <p>It is asserted that these shortcomings place existing infrastructure under considerable strain, and that any rezoning should be deferred until a comprehensive and deliverable infrastructure strategy is in place.</p> <p>Reference is also made to ongoing dissatisfaction with the planning process, with residents expressing a lack of confidence at a recent public meeting (as detailed in the accompanying attachment outlining community concerns). Issues previously raised, including those relating to the Part 8 housing scheme at Lehenaghmore, are noted as remaining unresolved.</p> <p>A central recommendation of the submission is the preparation of an Urban Framework Plan for Lehenaghmore, to guide the coordinated and sustainable development of the area. This plan should be informed by meaningful community engagement and address identified deficits across transport, utilities, social infrastructure and community facilities.</p> <p>The submission references a Council response acknowledging that significant infrastructure investment and long-term planning are required for the area, and argues that this supports a clear position that no further rezoning should proceed at this time.</p> <p>In conclusion, the submission calls for the taking in charge of existing estates, completion of current infrastructure works, and the preparation of a comprehensive framework plan prior to any consideration of additional residential zoning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	411	From:	Ailish Murphy
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to further rezoning at Lehenaghmore on the basis that existing infrastructure and services are already under significant strain.</p> <p>It highlights ongoing traffic congestion in Lehenaghmore, Airport Hill and the wider Togher area, noting that current road networks cannot accommodate existing volumes and that planned improvements, including footpaths and cycle lanes, are insufficient.</p>			

The submission also emphasises the lack of local amenities, resulting in high car dependency, and identifies key deficits including inadequate road capacity, limited public transport, and a lack of community services. While acknowledging the need for additional housing, the submission maintains that further development should only proceed once substantial infrastructure upgrades and services, such as improved roads, public transport, pedestrian infrastructure and local amenities, are delivered to ensure a sustainable quality of life for residents.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 20

Submission No.	412	From:	Oonagh Kearney
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands at NW3, Kerry Pike (adjacent to Millboro) from City Hinterland to “ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>While acknowledging the need for additional housing, it argues that recent growth in Kerry Pike has not been matched by the necessary infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Key concerns include deficiencies in road capacity, lack of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, limited public transport, and insufficient provision of essential services such as schools, childcare and local shops.</p> <p>It is asserted that further development without addressing these deficits would negatively impact the quality of life and safety of existing residents.</p> <p>The submission also emphasises the strong sense of community in Kerry Pike, noting local efforts to provide facilities such as a playground and ongoing fundraising for additional amenities. It argues that the scale of proposed development is disproportionate to the area’s capacity and risks undermining these community efforts. Concerns are raised that rezoning could exacerbate issues relating to public safety, access to green space, and availability of services, with potential negative consequences for residents’ wellbeing.</p> <p>Finally, the submission highlights the wider transport impacts of additional development, stating that increased traffic would not only affect Kerry Pike but also surrounding areas by worsening congestion at key bottlenecks, including Sunday’s Well, Shanakiel, Victoria Cross and the Angler’s Rest. It concludes that the proposed rezoning would create additional pressures on already constrained infrastructure and should not proceed without significant investment and capacity improvements.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	413	From:	Brice-Amelien Puvilland
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, for residential development. It argues that the area has already experienced significant growth without corresponding investment in infrastructure, resulting in severe traffic congestion, unsafe road conditions, and a lack of footpaths, cycle infrastructure and public transport. The submission highlights the impact on daily life, including increased commute times and unsafe conditions for pedestrians.</p>			

The submission also identifies substantial pressure on existing infrastructure and services, including frequent water and electricity disruptions, limited school and childcare capacity, and a lack of local amenities and community facilities. It contends that repeated commitments to deliver infrastructure improvements have not yet been realised, and concludes that further development would be premature and unsustainable unless essential infrastructure and services are delivered in advance.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	414	From:	Liam Cashman
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, arguing that the area has already experienced significant residential growth without corresponding investment in infrastructure and services. It highlights ongoing issues including poor road conditions, traffic congestion, speeding, lack of footpaths and traffic calming measures, and the absence of public transport. The submission asserts that these deficiencies have created unsafe conditions for residents.</p> <p>The submission concludes that Kerry Pike has reached capacity in its current state and cannot accommodate further housing development unless substantial improvements are made to local infrastructure. It emphasises that road and pedestrian safety issues are particularly acute and that further development may increase the risk of serious incidents if these matters are not addressed in advance.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	415	From:	Catherine McDonnell Cogan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission does not object in principle to additional housing development at Kerry Pike but raises concerns regarding local infrastructure and services. It highlights increased traffic levels on local roads, noting that speeding and the absence of continuous traffic calming measures have created safety issues for residents.</p> <p>While some footpath provision has been delivered near Millboro, the submission points out that this is incomplete, leaving sections without pedestrian infrastructure and exposing residents to traffic risks.</p> <p>The submission also raises concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure, particularly the reliance on septic tanks, which are described as no longer fit for purpose.</p> <p>It suggests that, in the context of ongoing and proposed development, there is a need to connect properties to the main sewer network to ensure environmental sustainability and reduce risks for residents.</p> <p>Overall, the submission calls for improvements to pedestrian safety, traffic management and wastewater infrastructure to support a safe and sustainable living environment.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Raymond Harrington</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission raises concerns regarding the adequacy of infrastructure to support further residential development in the Kerry Pike (Millboro) area. It highlights deficiencies in road infrastructure, including poor surfacing, absence of cycle lanes, lack of continuous footpaths and no public transport provision, alongside the non-delivery of previously indicated facilities such as a crèche and local shop. The submission also notes ongoing issues with water and electricity supply.</p> <p>While not opposing additional housing in principle, the submission contends that existing infrastructure is already under significant strain and that further development would exacerbate these issues. It concludes that infrastructure upgrades and service provision should be prioritised in advance of any additional rezoning or residential expansion.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Construction Industry Federation (CIF)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission welcomes the intent of Proposed Variation No. 3 and its alignment with national policy but emphasises that its success depends on practical deliverability, viability, and timely infrastructure provision. It notes that the Variation represents a major recalibration of the Core Strategy and that many newly zoned lands face constraints such as infrastructure deficits, challenging site conditions, fragmented ownership, and high enabling costs. The submission highlights the need for clear infrastructure sequencing, recommending a phased delivery schedule, interim mobility solutions, and prioritisation of Tier 1 serviced lands. It also seeks annual monitoring of housing output, flexibility on density where viability issues arise, and continued engagement between the Council and the construction sector. Concerns are raised regarding the Apartment Guidelines 2025 and their impact on viability, with a request for flexible application and avoidance of additional local standards. The submission also seeks flexibility in childcare requirements for apartment schemes, a phased approach to the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor, and a balanced rural housing policy that avoids unnecessary administrative burdens. Overall, the submission broadly supports the Variation but stresses that zoning, density, and design policies must remain viable and supported by coordinated infrastructure delivery.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 13			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Ruden Homes Ltd</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission, made on behalf of Ruden Homes Ltd, argues that lands at Lehenaghmore should be rezoned from “City Hinterland” to residential use, as they represent a logical and sustainable extension of the existing built-up area. The site directly adjoins established housing estates, is located within a designated compact growth area, and benefits from strong connectivity to key infrastructure, public transport, employment centres and community facilities. It is emphasised that the lands are fully serviceable, with water,</p>			

wastewater and road infrastructure already available or easily extendable, and that there are no significant environmental or planning constraints that would prevent development.

The submission further contends that rezoning the site would support the delivery of approximately 280 housing units in the short term, helping to address the significant shortfall in housing supply in Cork City, particularly in the south-west suburbs. It highlights alignment with national and local policy objectives promoting compact, sequential urban growth and the prioritisation of serviced lands.

The submission also notes that the site is not within the Airport safeguard zone which is proximate and concludes that the site represents a demonstrably deliverable opportunity to accelerate housing supply within the current Development Plan period.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 53

Submission No.	419	From:	Ruden Homes Ltd
----------------	-----	-------	-----------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to lands at Model Farm Road currently proposed to be rezoned from “City Hinterland” to “Long Term Strategic Development Lands.” While welcoming the recognition of the site’s residential development potential, the submission argues that a significant portion of the lands is capable of being delivered in the short term. It therefore requests that approximately 12–13 hectares be zoned as “ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods,” with the remaining c. 6.6 hectares retained as long-term strategic lands.

The submission sets out that a substantial portion of the site is immediately serviceable, with access to water, wastewater, transport infrastructure, and multiple access points. It highlights that existing and proposed sewer infrastructure has capacity to support approximately 530–560 residential units in the short term, with further upgrades facilitating development of the remaining lands.

The site is also described as well-located within an established suburban area, close to public transport, BusConnects routes, and future light rail, as well as a range of employment, education and community facilities.

Overall, the submission contends that rezoning part of the lands for near-term residential development would support compact growth and help meet housing targets, while still allowing for longer-term expansion.

It concludes that the site satisfies the Council’s criteria for deliverability and requests that the zoning be amended to reflect its serviceable capacity and development potential.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 39

Submission No.	420	From:	John Paul Twomey
----------------	-----	-------	------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission seeks a variation to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 to rezone a small parcel of land (c. 0.21 ha) at St. Anthony’s, Old Blarney Road, from “City Hinterland” to “ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods.” The proposal is put forward to facilitate the delivery

of a single family home, with the applicant stating that the lands are adjacent to an existing family dwelling and located within an established residential area.

The submission argues that rezoning would align with national policy promoting compact growth and the efficient use of underutilised land, particularly where sites are contiguous with existing development and capable of servicing. It also notes that the Revised National Planning Framework (2025) supports the review of existing hinterland zonings where lands represent a logical extension of the urban area.

The lands are described as serviceable (Tier 2), and it is contended that development would not compromise wider future development potential in the area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 54

Submission No.	421	From:	Dunluce Land Holdings Ltd
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes rezoning of the subject lands at Fairfield, Blackpool, from ZO17 Landscape Preservation Zone (LPZ) to ZO1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. It submits that the existing LPZ designation is no longer justified due to the fully urbanised context and that development of these infill lands with services and infrastructure within the built-up area reduces the need for peripheral greenfield expansion. It further submits that there are no significant constraints, such as flood risk heritage/ecological designations, or unsuitable topography.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 55			

Submission No.	422	From:	Laura Kingston
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of farmland areas around Sallybrook for housing development.</p> <p>Submission notes that Glanmire does not currently have the infrastructure, road capacity or local services to support another major development of this scale.</p> <p>Traffic congestion in Glanmire is already a serious issue, particularly during school drop-off and collection times and during peak commuting hours.</p> <p>The roads through Glashaboy, Crestfield and Hazelwood are residential estate roads and were never intended to act as through-routes for large volumes of traffic. Joining these housing estates through another large development will only increase traffic further. Residents will naturally use these connecting estates to access schools, shops and local services. If another 500 houses are added to the area, this could easily mean well over 1,000 additional cars using roads that are already struggling to cope. This will create even more bottlenecks, noise pollution and road safety concerns for residents, pedestrians and children. Increased development will also bring more construction traffic and larger vehicles into areas not designed to accommodate them.</p> <p>Another major concern is the lack of childcare, healthcare and school capacity in the area. There are also major concerns around community safety and policing. Glanmire is already well known as a hotspot for car thefts/burglaries, yet the area is served only by a part-time</p>			

Garda station despite the rapidly growing population. Connecting multiple estates together with additional roads and access points will make it even easier for criminals to move between estates and leave the area quickly. There are also environmental concerns regarding the loss of valuable greenbelt land and wildlife habitats. The lands being considered contain mature trees, hedgerows and natural habitats for wildlife. Submission requests for Further large-scale rezoning should not proceed until the existing issues are addressed.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 24

Submission No.	423	From:	Land Development Agency (LDA)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The Land Development Agency’s (LDA) submission is broadly supportive of Proposed Variation No. 3 and its role in ensuring the delivery of compact, infrastructure-led development which is crucial for ensuring the strategic growth of Cork City into the future. The LDA outlines its statutory role in delivering affordable and social housing on State-owned and other lands and emphasises its commitment to supporting compact, sustainable development and increased housing supply in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>The submission supports the overall intent of Proposed Variation No. 3 and Cork City Council’s approach to aligning with the NPF First Revision 2025, the section 28 NPF Implementation – Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines and other national planning guidelines.</p> <p>The submission refers to LDA-owned lands in Kilbarry comprising approximately 41 hectares of strategically located land identified as a key growth area in the City Development Plan. These lands were identified for transfer to the LDA in the Housing for All (2021) and included in the Report on Relevant Public Lands (2023 and 2025). While some of these lands are zoned for residential (c 15 ha) and public open space (c. 11 ha) uses, the remainder (c 15 ha) is currently zoned “ZO 20 City Hinterland” and designated “Long Term Strategic Development Land”.</p> <p>The zoning of these lands has not been proposed for amendment in Proposed Variation No. 3. The LDA supports this approach and refers to the Framework Plan for North Blackpool / Kilbarry currently being prepared by Cork City Council. The LDA supports the Council’s intention to finalise this process, which will support the planning and sustainable development of this strategic area. The submission also refers to the Northern Distributor Multimodal Route which will pass through part of the site. The submission states that while the northern portion of the site retains its ‘strategic reserve’ status, the LDA remains committed to the delivery of housing on this portion of the land and has been undertaking feasibility to support the future phased and sequential development in the medium to long term subject to infrastructure and zoning.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 14			

Submission No.	424	From:	Darol O Donovan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to the proposed rezoning of additional lands at Kerry Pike under Site Specific Objective 16, citing rapid population growth from 2016 to 2022 as evidence that the area has already experienced unsustainable expansion relative to other locations. It argues that this growth has not been supported by adequate infrastructure, with the local road</p>			

network operating beyond capacity and experiencing daily congestion, delays and associated safety concerns. The submission highlights that the absence of public transport and local services contributes to a high level of car dependency, which would be further exacerbated by additional residential development.

The submission also raises concerns regarding the capacity of existing utilities and community services, noting recurring water and electricity disruptions and insufficient provision of schools and childcare facilities. It concludes that, in the absence of significant upgrades to transport infrastructure, utilities and social services, the proposed rezoning would be premature and unsustainable, and should not proceed at this time.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	425	From:	Cllr Joe Lynch & Donnchadh O Laoghaire TD
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises strong concerns regarding the proposed zoning of lands at Lehenaghmore (SW1 and SW2), arguing that such development is premature in the absence of essential infrastructure.</p> <p>In particular, it highlights longstanding deficits in road connectivity, including the need for a new link to Sarsfield Road and resolution of the Pouladuff Road bottleneck, as well as delays in the delivery of community facilities such as childcare, healthcare, retail services, and recreational amenities. It also notes reported drainage issues in the area, with concerns that additional development, particularly at SW1, could exacerbate existing problems if not properly addressed.</p> <p>The submission points to a history of development proceeding in advance of infrastructure, contributing to ongoing service constraints.</p> <p>The submission calls for an “infrastructure-first” approach, with emphasis on preparing a community infrastructure delivery plan, ensuring delivery of previously permitted but undelivered facilities, and addressing estate taking-in-charge issues.</p> <p>The submission further seeks firm commitments and clarity from the Council on key transport projects, including new road connections and the Southern Distributor Road, and stresses that no additional rezoning or development should proceed until these infrastructure and servicing issues, including drainage capacity, are adequately resolved.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	426	From:	KPH
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks the rezoning of c. 6.2 hectares of land at Clogheen from Light Industry and City Hinterland to Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods in order to address a structural imbalance between jobs and housing provision in the north-west of Cork City.</p> <p>It highlights that the Knocknaheeny/Hollyhill area contains one of the city’s largest employment hubs, anchored by Apple’s European Headquarters with over 5,000 employees, yet there is a significant shortfall of available and appropriate housing, particularly private and mixed-tenure units.</p>			

This imbalance is reflected in the dominance of social housing (up to 50% overall and over 80% in some areas), alongside very low levels of private rental and owner-occupier housing, limiting choice and preventing workers from living locally

As a result, 94% of workers commute into the area, demonstrating a clear disconnect. The submission links this directly to unsustainable, car-dependent commuting patterns, weak local population growth, and a lack of integrated community development, as residents and workers are largely separate populations.

The lands at Clogheen are presented as a logical and serviced urban expansion site, located close to employment, existing services, and planned transport infrastructure such as BusConnects and the Northern Distributor Road.

The submission argues that rezoning would align with national policy and increased housing targets under the National Planning Framework (2025), enabling compact growth and transport-oriented development.

It concludes that rezoning the site would help rebalance housing supply by delivering much-needed private and mixed-tenure homes, improve the job–housing relationship, reduce long-distance commuting, and support the creation of a more sustainable, diverse, and integrated community in Cork’s north-west suburbs.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 56

Submission No.	427	From:	Caroline McGarry
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of the Moneygourney lands. The objection is primarily based on the lack of infrastructure, and the already developed housing estates in the greater areas of Maryborough Hill, Moneygourney, Garryduff, Coach Hill, Clarkes Hill, main Rochestown road and Douglas, with regard to future traffic congestion.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	428	From:	Cllr Joe Lynch
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission raises concerns regarding proposed text changes to Chapters 2 and 6 of the Development Plan, stating that they are premature in the absence of a wider review of greenbelt strategy.			
It requests that the proposed amendments be deleted and that existing wording be retained, on the basis that such matters should be addressed as part of the next City Development Plan process.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 71			

Submission No.	429	From:	Belgard Estates
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the overall direction of the Variation, particularly its focus on compact growth, transport-oriented development, and infrastructure-led housing delivery. Ballincollig is identified as a key growth area within Cork City, and the submission stresses the need for coordinated, long-term planning to avoid fragmented development. The subject lands at Classis, Ballincollig, spanning both Cork City and County, are considered a single strategic opportunity for a residential-led, mixed-use community. However, the portion within the city is currently zoned for light industrial use. Belgard Estates requests that the Council ensure the city-side lands are planned in an integrated, cross-boundary manner aligned with wider growth strategies. Specifically, they ask that the Variation: Recognises the importance of infrastructure-led development at the Ballincollig–City interface, supports a masterplan approach to deliver a high-quality, coordinated community, provides a clear framework for engagement and coordination between stakeholders. Belgard Estates also expresses willingness to work collaboratively with the Council to develop a practical and deliverable planning framework for the area.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 70			

Submission No.	430	From:	Laurence O'Driscoll
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission strongly objects to further rezoning in Kerry Pike, citing significant deficiencies in infrastructure and services relative to recent population growth.</p> <p>It highlights ongoing traffic congestion, absence of public transport, inadequate and discontinuous footpaths, and a high level of car dependency. It also raises concerns regarding frequent water and electricity outages and damage to local roads.</p> <p>The submission further notes the lack of local amenities such as childcare facilities, increasing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>It concludes that until meaningful improvements are made to transport, utilities and community services, additional residential development would exacerbate existing issues and should not proceed.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	431	From:	Jeremiah Lynch & O'Flynn Group
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission seeks the rezoning of lands at Curraheen to support residential development under Proposed Variation No. 3. It outlines that the site is strategically located adjoining the existing urban area, with strong access to the N40, public transport, and a range of services and employment centres.</p> <p>The lands are described as well-serviced, with water, wastewater and infrastructure connections available, and capable of delivering a significant quantum of housing. It is</p>			

proposed that a portion of the lands be rezoned for immediate residential development, with the remainder identified for longer-term strategic growth.

The submission highlights strong housing demand and supply shortages in the Bishopstown/Curraheen area and contends that rezoning would support compact, sequential development in line with national policy.

It states that the lands can deliver housing in both the short and medium term and includes provision for critical infrastructure, such as a new ESB substation, to support wider area growth.

It concludes that the site represents a sustainable and deliverable opportunity to contribute to Cork City’s housing supply over the lifetime of the current and future Development Plans.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 57

Submission No.	432	From:	Electricity Supply Board (ESB)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission sets out that ESB is continuously assessing and reviewing electricity network capacity in Cork City to ensure alignment with current and future development needs. Through ongoing studies and monitoring, ESB identifies where reinforcements, upgrades, or new infrastructure may be required to support residential, commercial, and industrial growth including those identified through the Proposed Variation process.</p> <p>Within the Cork City Council administrative area, the submission highlights that ESB Networks has identified a number of electricity infrastructure projects that are required to address existing network constraints and to accommodate forecast increases in electricity demand arising from residential growth, urban regeneration and mixed-use development. These projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the delivery of new high-voltage substations and capacity uprating of existing substations, and capacity upgrades at strategically located substations such as the Marina, as well as the provision of new high-voltage substations to serve growth areas in Bishopstown / Wilton, Churchfield / Kilnap and the Mayfield / Riverstown area; and</li> <li>• reinforcement of key 38 kV circuits serving established urban areas and emerging growth locations, with a series of 38 kV cable and line reinforcement projects proposed along key corridors connecting Kilbarry, Mayfield, Fairhill, Dennehy’s Cross and other central urban locations, responding to both circuit loading and asset condition constraints.</li> </ul> <p>These projects are intended to support the continued functioning of the city’s electricity network while enabling the scale and distribution of development envisaged under the Development Plan and Proposed Variation No. 3, and they underline the importance of safeguarding existing electricity assets and providing flexibility for future infrastructure delivery within zoned lands and regeneration areas.</p> <p>ESB requests that due consideration is given to the issues raised in the submission, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding the long-term operational requirements of ESB’s existing transmission and distribution assets, particularly high-voltage substations within Cork City which are essential to maintaining security of supply, network resilience, and the capacity to accommodate future growth arising from revised housing targets.</li> <li>• Advocating for a proactive, collaborative partnership between Cork City Council and ESB to identify, zone, and secure suitable sites for new electricity infrastructure is</li> </ul>			

critical to ensuring that network reinforcement keeps pace with increased residential zoning and population growth envisaged under Proposed Variation No. 3.

- Revised housing growth requirements must be supported by timely and coordinated investment in electricity infrastructure. Critical network upgrades and capacity enhancements across transmission, medium-voltage, and low-voltage systems are essential to address existing constraints, facilitate renewable integration, and support sustainable residential and industrial development.
- Ensuring that public utilities are permissible under all zoning objectives is fundamental to enabling the efficient and cost-effective delivery of electricity infrastructure, reducing delivery risk, and avoiding delays that could undermine housing delivery and climate action commitments.
- Early engagement with ESB in the planning and design of roads, public realm works, and greenways should be explicitly supported, enabling the coordinated provision of ducting and underground cabling and minimising future disruption and whole-life costs.

Continued investment in electricity infrastructure in Cork City is a prerequisite for achieving national growth objectives under the National Planning Framework, the Revised NPF housing targets, and Ireland’s transition to a low-carbon, climate-resilient energy system.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 15

Submission No.	433	From:	Oonagh Collins
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to proposed rezoning of lands near Crestfield and Hazelwood Estates in Glanmire (NE1). Crestfield and Hazelwood are long-established, quiet, safe residential estates. Children play in the large green space and in the cul-de-sacs; existing traffic by the green space is already a concern, and any further increase would be worrying, while any potential through-road at the cul-de-sac would remove this safe play environment for younger children.</p> <p>The roads through the estates of Hazelwood and Crestfield are narrow and winding, and were never designed or constructed to carry the volume of traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. Finally, the submission highlights that the exit road from the Hazelwood Avenue is congested at peak times and is almost impossible to exit onto Hazelwood Road. The volumes of traffic in and around Glanmire area in general are more than the current road network can accommodate.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	434	From:	Niall Murphy (with partners Galtymore Developments)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission, made on behalf of the landowner, relates to Proposed Variation No. 3 to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028. It follows an earlier request to rezone part of these lands, which was not supported. While an adjoining site (NW1) is now proposed for rezoning, it is argued that the lands should also be reconsidered. The lands at Killeens (approx. 7 hectares)</p>			

are well-located adjacent to existing residential development, making them suitable for a natural and sequential extension of the village. They are relatively low-lying, visually contained, and capable of accommodating over 315 residential units with minimal visual impact, unlike the higher-elevation NW1 lands. The submission highlights the potential for a high-quality, phased residential development, starting with the regeneration of an existing brownfield farmyard site, aligning with City Development Plan objectives for compact growth and brownfield development. Strong supporting infrastructure is emphasised, including, existing road access and multiple connection points to nearby estates, ongoing wastewater upgrades, proximity to planned major transport infrastructure (Northern Distributor Road, future rail stations), access to public transport, employment hubs, retail centres, and amenities. The lands are serviced and the landowner can progress quickly. The submission argues that rezoning these lands would support national and local housing objectives, provide a deliverable and sustainable housing opportunity, and contribute positively to housing supply. The Council is therefore requested to reconsider rezoning the lands.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 58

Submission No.	435	From:	Joe & Richard Donovan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks the rezoning of c.4.15ha of lands in agricultural use from ZO20 City Hinterland to ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods, stating that the site is an extension of the built-up area and positioned for sequential growth. It further states that the site is serviceable, has low flood risk, no environmental or heritage constraints and is ‘in close proximity’ to existing transport infrastructure including bus routes and cycle networks. It asserts that including some smaller sites rather than relying too heavily on a small number of large landbanks reduces risk and improves housing supply outcomes. It specifically suggests that the quantum of lands proposed for rezoning under NE 4 or in proximity to Ballyvolane could be reduced for reallocation to these lands.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 59			

Submission No.	436	From:	Donal Kelleher
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes two sites for rezoning from ZO 20 City Hinterland to ZO 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods. They comprise a 6.33 hectare tract at Ballyphillip (‘Option A’) and a 7-hectare tract at Rathcooney North (‘Option B’). It states that: Option A is ‘not immediately adjacent to the existing village edge’ and that Option B is located directly adjacent to existing residential developments; the sites are serviceable within five years, have good public transport accessibility; existing social infrastructure capacity (schools, community facilities, employment areas), and no significant development constraints. It further submits that their development would align with national, regional, and local planning policy and climate objectives.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 60			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Peter Hyde</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks permission for a two-storey dwelling on unzoned City Hinterland lands at Mount Desert and requests that the lands be rezoned for residential use to accommodate this contending that the site forms part of an established residential cluster at the suburban edge and represents consolidation rather than isolated rural development.</p> <p>The submission relies on local planning precedents, the existing pattern of development, and design/sustainability credentials, together with a live work element linked to remote working. The central issue for consideration is whether, having regard to the site context and established development pattern, the proposal can be considered acceptable in principle notwithstanding its unzoned status under the Development Plan.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 61			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Stanta Developments Ltd</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission requests that a portion of land adjacent to Douglas Hall GAA club which is currently zoned ‘Sports ground’ and two other areas zoned ‘open space’ be rezoned to residential given they are steeply sloped and of no value for sporting activities. The submitter acknowledges that the proposed access road to the wider Large Scale residential Development transverses the sites and outlines that the City Development plan classifies roads as ‘permitted in principle’ on open space and sports fields however it is considered that rezoning these sites to residential for the avoidance of doubt would be beneficial for the development and alignment with the City Development Plan.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 62			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Sean Sheehy</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission objects to further residential development at Lehenaghmore, citing long-standing deficiencies in infrastructure and services, as previously identified in an academic thesis. It highlights the continued lack of local amenities, including shops, childcare facilities, healthcare services and recreational spaces, despite recent development in the area.</p> <p>The submission also raises concerns regarding traffic congestion, noting recent instances of severe gridlock during road closures. It argues that housing development is being advanced without adequate supporting infrastructure or a coherent strategy, and concludes that necessary services and infrastructure must be delivered prior to any further development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	440	From:	St Finbarrs GAA Club
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission broadly supports efforts to address the housing crisis but raises significant concerns regarding the proposed rezoning at SW3 Sandbrook, Wilton.</p> <p>It states that the indicative rezoning boundary appears to encroach on an existing playing pitch (Pitch 2), and that any loss of this facility would have a serious impact on the club’s operations and long-term viability.</p> <p>The submission also highlights concerns regarding potential impacts on biodiversity, noting the presence of a stream connected to the Glasheen River and the ecological value of the site. It advocates for the retention of the lands as sports grounds (ZO16), consistent with Development Plan objectives relating to green and blue infrastructure.</p> <p>The submission concludes by recommending against the proposed rezoning and expresses a willingness to engage further with the Council.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 21			

Submission No.	441	From:	Murnane & O’Shea Ltd
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks a refinement to the alignment of the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor (STC) and an associated link road connecting the corridor to the existing Maglin Road.</p> <p>It builds on ongoing development proposals within the Maglin Urban Expansion Area (MUEA), including permitted and proposed large-scale residential schemes at Greenfield and Carriganarra, and is presented as part of a coordinated approach to facilitate the timely delivery of housing within this strategic growth area.</p> <p>The submission argues that the currently indicated alignment of the link road does not adequately account for site-specific constraints identified through detailed investigation, including archaeological features that require preservation, the agreed realignment of the existing Maglin Road, and the need to accommodate appropriate access and interaction with a proposed school site.</p> <p>It is stated that these factors necessitate a revised alignment in order to ensure the efficient functioning of the road network and appropriate integration with surrounding development lands.</p> <p>A refined alignment is proposed which shifts the link road to avoid archaeological constraints, improve its junction with the existing road network, and facilitate a more coherent arrangement of adjacent zoned lands, including the SW11 Neighbourhood and Local Centre zoning objective.</p> <p>The submission maintains that this revised alignment has already been discussed with the Planning Authority and accepted in principle, and that it would provide a superior urban design outcome and more effective connectivity within the MUEA.</p> <p>The submitter emphasises that the proposed changes are minor in nature and consistent with the indicative status of the STC route as acknowledged in the Development Plan. It is argued that the refinement would optimise the development potential of surrounding lands,</p>			

support the delivery of housing, and ensure the corridor functions effectively as part of an integrated transport network.

In conclusion it is requested that the Development Plan be amended to reflect the refined alignment, noting that the change would constitute a non-material alteration that aligns with previously agreed principles and supports the overall delivery of the MUEA.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 36

Submission No.	442	From:	McHugh Property Developments
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes to rezone land at Middle Glanmire Road, Montenotte, from Public Open Space to a residential zoning. The applicant expresses disappointment that the Council has retained the existing zoning, submitting this is a material error that prevents development and undermines the purpose of the variation, which is to accelerate housing delivery in line with national planning policy. The submission argues that the current Public Open Space zoning is inappropriate and ineffective, as the site is not and has never functioned as accessible public open space. The land is fenced, overgrown, privately managed, and unusable by the public, meaning the zoning objective (ZO15) is not being met and cannot be achieved. Maintaining this designation is therefore considered poor planning practice, as it does not protect any genuine public amenity but instead prevents the appropriate redevelopment of an underutilised urban site. They request that the Council reconsider and rezone the lands for residential use.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 63			

Submission No.	443	From:	Mark Long
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission states that the Lehenaghmore/Togher area has been under-resourced for over 20 years and is already overcrowded and heavily reliant on cars. It argues that the addition of 700 new houses would significantly worsen these issues unless new infrastructure, services, and relief roads are provided. The submission emphasizes that residents deserve to have their concerns heard.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	444	From:	Cork Airport
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission acknowledges the positive policy context set by the City Development Plan in relation to Cork Airport, including its critical role in support Cork City’s economic, spatial and infrastructural development. More specifically, the submission sets out Cork Airport’s position with respect two proposed sites included in Proposed Variation No. 3: SW 1, Lehenaghmore (off Togher Road) and SW 6, Spur Hill, Doughcloyne. The key issue of concern</p>			

relates to the fact that both sites are located within the Airport’s Noise Zone and Public Safety Zones. In addition, Cork Airport have expressed a view that one or both of these land banks may be needed to deliver a southern light rail spur from the proposed east / west ‘Cork Luas’ corridor to facilitate a direct light rail connection to Cork Airport or to facilitate a secondary access road access from the Southern Distributor Road.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 16

Submission No.	445	From:	O’Flynn Construction Co. Unlimited Company
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the Proposed Variation No. 3 to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028 and the continued identification of the Maglin / South Ballincollig lands as a key residential growth area, noting that the subject lands (c. 28.7 ha) are zoned for residential development and are subject to a current LRD application for approximately 1,150 units, including associated infrastructure and services.</p> <p>It acknowledges that the lands form part of a strategic Urban Expansion Area intended to deliver compact growth in Ballincollig and highlights that elements of the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor (STC) are already being delivered as part of permitted and proposed residential schemes.</p> <p>However, the submission raises concern that the wording of the proposed variation places undue emphasis on the delivery of the STC in advance of residential development.</p> <p>It argues that this approach could delay housing delivery in a strategically important location, does not reflect the reality that infrastructure and housing are being delivered concurrently, and is misaligned with national policy objectives to accelerate housing supply.</p> <p>The key ask of the submission is that the Development Plan wording, particularly in Section 10.220, be amended to allow residential development to proceed in tandem with the STC rather than being contingent upon its prior delivery.</p> <p>It seeks the removal or revision of any wording that implies a sequential dependency, the inclusion of recognition that portions of the STC are already being delivered alongside residential schemes, and a policy approach that supports the coordinated and phased delivery of both housing and enabling infrastructure.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 37			

Submission No.	446	From:	Joanne Burke
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission regarding the proposed rezoning of lands at Zoning Ref NW 1 from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhoods. While not opposed to housing in principle, the submission argues that the rezoning is premature and unsupported by evidence demonstrating adequate infrastructure, safe access, and necessary services.</p> <p>In particular, there is strong concern about any reliance on Seanabothair or Lios Cara as access routes, as these are existing residential estate roads not designed to accommodate</p>			

significant additional traffic, with potential implications for road safety, emergency access, and overall residential amenity.

The submission highlights existing pressures on the local road network, water supply issues, lack of services such as shops, schools, and public transport, and the likelihood of increased car dependency. It also raises concerns about construction impacts, public safety, and antisocial behaviour, as well as the cumulative effect of further development on an already constrained area. The submission requests that the rezoning be refused unless comprehensive assessments are carried out and demonstrate that infrastructure, services, and access arrangements can safely support development.

Should the rezoning proceeds, the submission seeks strict safeguards, including prohibition of access through existing estates, confirmation of infrastructure capacity, and requirements for detailed transport, safety, and community impact assessments.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 30

Submission No.	447	From:	Glashaboy Woodland Group
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission from Glashaboy Woodland Group of residents (a small established low-density residential area located in a unique wooded riverside setting above the Glashaboy River), objecting to the rezoning for a high-density development at this location on the basis that, although housing is needed, the location is unsuitable. The lands proposed for rezoning currently form the final remaining green woodland buffer between residents' homes and the continued urban expansion of the wider Glanmire area. Rezoning would remove a greenfield area of environmental, visual and social importance to local residents, which represents one of the last remaining undeveloped woodland and greenfield areas on the Glanmire side of the motorway. The proposed flood relief works within the Glanmire/Sallybrook area notwithstanding, building on this currently permeable green land and replacing it with roads/hard surfaces/buildings would reduce absorption of significant rainfall and surface water and exacerbate existing issues of surface runoff, particularly given the elevated, sloping topography of the site, located above the residents' homes. Existing drainage infrastructure and culverts in the area already struggle during heavy rainfall events, and the removal of this natural absorption land would significantly increase downstream flood risks. The Natura Impact Statement prepared as part of the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme identifies ecological sensitivities relating to otters and bats within the Sallybrook and Glashaboy River corridor and highlights the importance of habitat protection and mitigation measures within the river corridor environment. The proposed site is critically important to biodiversity and development could pose risks to the ecological quality of the Glashaboy River corridor. The submission expresses concern that further development will place additional pressure on existing services and infrastructure such as roads (which are already severely congested), schools, and healthcare. Increased traffic will exacerbate traffic congestion and road safety, particularly during the construction phase and beyond. Finally, the submission highlights that the existing wooded and riverside character of their area would be fundamentally altered, and that the proposed development would represent an excessive and inappropriate concentration of development directly overlooking a small quiet established residential community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kevin Downey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning and development of the South Ballincollig STC and the area south of Heathfield, expressing concern that the existing road network cannot safely accommodate the significant increase in traffic expected from the planned residential expansions. They highlight that Heathfield has only one access point and that directing additional traffic through the estate would worsen already heavy congestion at the Killumney/Carriganarra Road junction, particularly during school peak times. They also note that current traffic levels already exceed safe capacity.</p> <p>The submission further raises concerns about the lack of viable public-transport alternatives, as major transport projects remain in early planning stages and the nearest bus stop is a considerable walking distance away.</p> <p>The submission requests that safety measures be considered, including alternative access routes that do not pass through Heathfield, as well as speed-control features, pedestrian crossings, and boundary treatments to protect residents—especially children—from increased traffic and noise.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 72			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Murnane &amp; O’Shea Ltd</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks a refinement to the alignment of the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor (STC), arguing that the currently indicated route would constrain housing delivery, create sub-optimal urban design, and present avoidable construction and environmental risks.</p> <p>This position is supported by a detailed Hydraulic Analysis Report, which assesses the impact of a modified road alignment and proposed residential development at Carriganarra on flood risk.</p> <p>The report confirms that updated modelling, incorporating new topographical survey data and revised road design, shows only minor and localised changes to flood levels, generally in the order of a few millimetres, with a maximum increase of approximately 220mm confined to limited upstream areas. It concludes that these impacts do not affect existing properties or third-party lands and are consistent with the findings of the South Ballincollig Drainage Study SFRA.</p> <p>The analysis finds that the revised road alignment and associated land infilling would not significantly increase flood risk and can be accommodated with appropriate design and mitigation measures, including culvert sizing and detailed engineering at design stage.</p> <p>Overall, the combined documents argue that the proposed refined alignment would enable better urban integration, maximise housing yield, reduce construction complexity, and remain acceptable in flood risk terms, and therefore should be incorporated into the Development Plan as a minor amendment facilitating sustainable development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 36			

Submission No.	450	From:	Clockstrike Ltd in conjunction with Cairn Homes
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the proposed rezoning of the Ringwood (NW6) lands to ZO 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods and requests that this zoning be confirmed in the adopted Variation. It also seeks what they consider minor amendments to the zoning boundary and revisions to the wording of Site Specific Objective SSO17, particularly to ensure that infrastructure requirements are clearly defined and do not delay delivery of housing.</p> <p>The justification is that the lands are considered ready for development, with detailed masterplanning completed and active planning applications already underway, including permitted and proposed housing phases.</p> <p>The submission states that this demonstrates the lands are serviceable, accessible and deliverable in the short term, with a developer actively progressing construction.</p> <p>It further argues that the rezoning aligns with strategic planning policy, particularly the promotion of transport-oriented development linked to the Cork Commuter Rail project, and will contribute to meeting housing supply targets. The site is described as having planned road and active travel infrastructure, including the Ringwood Link Road, which supports sustainable movement.</p> <p>Finally, the submission contends that minor mapping and text changes are necessary to ensure consistency with detailed engineering design and to avoid unnecessary delays, especially where large-scale infrastructure (such as bridges to the proposed rail station) could otherwise hinder timely housing delivery.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 34			

Submission No.	451	From:	Niall Buckley
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposal for additional rezoning in Lehenaghmore, submitted on the closing date for observations, noting that it adds to existing proposed rezonings in the area.</p> <p>It expresses concern at the cumulative scale of development being considered despite repeated issues raised in earlier submissions.</p> <p>The submission highlights that the lands are located along a narrow county road leading to an already congested area with limited infrastructure and services.</p> <p>It concludes that, given the existing constraints and lack of supporting facilities, the further proposed rezoning is inappropriate.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

Submission No.	452	From:	Cork City Local Community Development Committee
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission is made by Cork City Local Community Development Committee (LCDC) with a view to supporting quality housing development within a framework of building communities and encouraging a balanced approach, as set out in the Local Economic and Community Plan 2024-2029 (LECP) which complements the City Development Plan. The submission points out that failure to do so can lead to ongoing inequality and weakened social cohesion.</p> <p>The submission makes a number of thematic and area-specific recommendations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the need for a health impact assessment (HIA) of Proposed Variation No. 3, its need to align with national and international strategies, the provision of infrastructure in tandem with housing, the prioritisation of existing zoned land and derelict sites, a concentration of zoning on the northside and a stronger focus on the positive impact that placemaking has on community health and wellbeing; inclusivity of housing provision across all cohorts of society is also highlighted;</li> <li>the submission cautions against an over-reliance on one-bedroom and studio units against demographic evidence and associated potential impacts on childcare provision;</li> <li>the submission supports the protection for landscape character and the reuse of existing structures, as outlined in Proposed Variation No. 3;</li> <li>in relation to the Ballyvolane Strategic Growth Area, the submission welcomes the general focus on community and social infrastructure included in Proposed Variation No. 3 but requests pre-development requirements for at least one community centre to match the existing housing stock and the projected increase in housing provision;</li> <li>the submission supports the north-east and north-west regional parks;</li> <li>in relation to the neighbourhood development sites and associated site-specific objectives in Ballincollig (Neighbourhood Development Site 4, Site-Specific Objective 6 and Site-Specific Objective 7), the submission advocates for the provision of a new community centre, sports centre, or library; and</li> <li>in relation to the site-specific objectives associated with Lehenaghmore, the submission identifies this as an area of significant housing growth close to an area of high deprivation in Togher and recommend that a new community or sports facility be incorporated into this rezoning.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 75			

Submission No.	453	From:	Cirio Homes
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes to rezone lands at Rathcooney Road, Arderrow, Ballyvolane, from ZO20 City Hinterland &amp; ZO15 Public Open Space to ZO2 New Residential Neighbourhoods. The submission states that the lands form a sequential extension of the existing urban area and are immediately adjacent to existing ZO2 zoned lands, that the lands can integrate with planned transport, active travel, and community infrastructure, and that there is a shortfall of deliverable residential land in Variation No. 3 that the subject lands could help fulfil.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 28			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>L. Falcon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to further residential development in Lehenaghmore, stating that existing infrastructure is already inadequate and that additional housing would exacerbate traffic congestion, which is currently having a serious impact on residents’ quality of life.</p> <p>While proposed improvements such as a bus service and bike lanes are welcomed, it is considered that these measures alone are insufficient to address the overall traffic issues.</p> <p>The submission also highlights a lack of essential local services and amenities, including shops, schools, childcare facilities, and recreational areas, which increases reliance on private cars. It concludes that further housing should not proceed until traffic is properly addressed and a full range of services and infrastructure are in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Louise O’Neill</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands in Lehenaghmore for approximately 700 additional residential units, on the basis that the area lacks the infrastructure, amenities, and transport capacity to support further growth. It highlights that the area is already heavily constrained by traffic congestion and ongoing roadworks, creating a bottleneck that is impacting daily life for residents.</p> <p>The submission also notes the absence of essential services such as a park, childcare facilities, schools, shops, healthcare provision, and adequate public transport, including the lack of bus lanes in current upgrades. It concludes that, given the existing deficiencies, the scale of additional housing proposed is not feasible and should not proceed until the necessary infrastructure and services are delivered.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Roisin Quain</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of additional lands in the Kerry Pike area for further residential development, on the basis that existing infrastructure and services are already under significant strain.</p> <p>While acknowledging substantial housing growth in recent years, it highlights that the supporting infrastructure—including roads, footpaths, public transport, and utilities—has not been delivered in tandem.</p> <p>The submission notes ongoing issues with traffic congestion, lack of a promised bus service, and inadequate pedestrian facilities, all of which are negatively impacting safety and accessibility for local residents.</p>			

It further raises concerns about the cumulative pressure on local infrastructure, including frequent electricity and water outages, damage to roads from construction traffic, and the absence of essential community services such as childcare and local amenities.

As a result, residents are increasingly reliant on private cars, exacerbating congestion and safety issues.

The submission concludes that, in the absence of meaningful and demonstrable improvements in infrastructure and service provision, any additional rezoning for residential development in Kerry Pike would be premature and should be reconsidered.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	457	From:	Suzanne O'Mahony
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands behind Millboro on the basis that Kerry Pike has already undergone extensive residential expansion without the necessary supporting infrastructure. Despite eight major housing developments and a rapidly growing population, the village still lacks adequate road capacity, safe pedestrian routes, continuous footpaths, and reliable utilities.</p> <p>Traffic congestion, poor road conditions, and dangerous crossing points are highlighted as ongoing safety concerns. The submission also notes the absence of a bus service, cycle lanes, and promised childcare facilities, alongside frequent water and electricity outages and ongoing disruption from construction activity.</p> <p>They emphasise that community amenities have been delivered solely through local volunteer efforts rather than developer or state investment.</p> <p>The submission concludes that further rezoning is unjustifiable until essential infrastructure is properly provided.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

Submission No.	458	From:	Fionnuala Duggan
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed rezoning of NW 3 Kerry Pike, adjacent to Millboro, from ZO 20 City Hinterland to ZO 02 New Residential Neighbourhoods. They argue that Kerry Pike has already experienced substantial residential expansion without the delivery of essential supporting infrastructure. According to the submission, the area lacks safe and adequate roads, pedestrian crossings, footpaths, speed-calming measures, public transport, school capacity, childcare facilities, shops, a pharmacy, and sufficient green spaces. The submitter maintains that the village is already under significant pressure due to these deficits.</p> <p>The submission further states that allowing additional housing on the proposed rezoned lands would worsen existing safety risks and infrastructural strain. The submitter argues that rezoning in the absence of proper transport and community infrastructure does not address the housing crisis responsibly and instead places residents at risk. They conclude that further</p>			

development should not proceed until the fundamental infrastructure required to support a growing population is in place.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Peppard Construction Ltd</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission proposes to rezone noted lands at White’s Cross from ZO 9 Light Industry and Related Uses to ZO 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods. It submits that there is surrounding industrial capacity nearby and further that the subject lands are serviced and would maximise return on existing infrastructure development in the area, are contiguous to other residential development, and that the propose housing scheme would incorporate identified needs, including community infrastructure (e.g. recreation space, facilities) and a nursing home, independent living, and ageing-in-place units.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 64

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Murnane &amp; O’Shea Ltd</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

This submission consists of two related documents including an earlier rezoning submission from November 2025 and a subsequent updated submission in May 2026.

The November 2025 submission provides the detailed planning, policy, flood risk, and urban design rationale for the rezoning of c.3.7 hectares of land at Carriganarra from public open space (ZO15) to residential zoning (ZO1) to facilitate housing delivery.

The later submission builds on this by refining the request to c.2.6 hectares in the context of Proposed Variation No. 3 and aligning it with a revised Sustainable Transport Corridor (STC) route, with both submissions intended to be read together as part of a coordinated proposal. [

When read together the submissions argue that the proposed rezoning is consistent with national and local planning policy, including the National Planning Framework and Section 28 Housing Growth Guidelines, which require increased housing delivery and the identification of additional serviceable lands.

The lands are identified as forming part of the Maglin Urban Expansion Area, a key strategic growth area for Ballincollig, and are presented as contributing to compact, sequential development and the achievement of housing targets.

The justification includes detailed flood risk analysis indicating that the lands can be developed subject to mitigation, with any changes in flood levels described as localised and not impacting existing or third-party properties. The submissions state that the proposal satisfies the Justification Test under the Flood Risk Management Guidelines and aligns with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment underpinning the Development Plan.

The submissions further emphasise that the rezoning would improve urban design and placemaking by allowing a more coherent relationship between residential development and the transport corridor, avoiding excessive separation and enabling the corridor to function as an urban street. It is also stated that the lands are serviced or capable of being serviced in the

short term, are accessible, and could be delivered in the near future, thereby contributing to housing supply and the coordinated development of the wider expansion area.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 65

Submission No.	461	From:	The Jenkins Family
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission from a family residing in Crestfield, Glanmire, objecting to the rezoning of NE1 owing to the following concerns. The proposal to route traffic from the new development through existing estates would result in a dangerous, busy, main road with a constant flow of traffic, and resultant safety concerns, particularly for children playing outside. In addition, a through-road would result in increased noise and pollution and a loss of privacy. The area is also experiencing increased traffic volumes generally due to recent development with increased population and exacerbated by roadworks. To suggest another housing development with a new access route through the existing estate will only exacerbate this problem with lasting negative effects. Finally, the submission highlights that maintaining the current zoning will preserve what remains of the nature habitat which has been affected by the removal of green space through recent construction.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	462	From:	DCN Developments Ltd
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission supports the proposed rezoning of NE 1. It states that the land is serviced, within the built-up footprint, and has no significant restraints in respect of flooding, ecology, or heritage. It further submits that the lands face fewer delivery challenges on a relative scale to alternative sites.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

Submission No.	463	From:	Donal Lucey
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission strongly objects to the proposed rezoning of lands behind Millboro in Kerry Pike, stating that recent housing growth has not been supported by adequate infrastructure, particularly in relation to community facilities and local services. It argues that the area is already under strain and lacks the essential amenities required to support existing residents.</p> <p>In particular, the submission highlights the absence of key community infrastructure such as childcare facilities, public transport, and safe pedestrian links, noting that most local amenities have been delivered through voluntary community efforts rather than planned provision. It concludes that further development should not proceed until appropriate community facilities and supporting infrastructure are put in place.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cairn Homes</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
The submission supports the proposed rezoning of NE 4. It submits that the site is strategically located to support compact growth in the north-east suburbs, has the capacity to deliver housing immediately, and will be designed to integrate with and complement delivery of the proposed regional park.			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 27			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Cirio Homes</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission requests that the full Phase 1 and 2 lands shown within their submission are included as part of Site SE6 which currently only includes 2.26ha of the 8.93ha landholdings that the submitter believes are suitable for immediate residential development.</p> <p>The submitter states that the lands are currently or will be fully serviced within 5 years and the overall site represents a highly sustainable, serviceable residential development opportunity capable of contributing towards Cork City’s housing delivery shortfall.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that failing to rezone the entirety of the Phase 1 lands would risk creating an unnecessary interruption in housing delivery and infrastructure investment within the area which is already demonstrating active and successful residential growth, that the rezoning opportunity would maximise the efficient use of infrastructure and avoid piecemeal fragmented development, and would contribute towards achieving housing delivery objectives within both the NPF and Cork City Development Plan.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 19			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Office of Public Works (OPW)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission focuses on ongoing and proposed flood reliefs schemes in the area impacted by the proposed variation and makes a number of observations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to considering flood risk on particular sites or areas located in flood zones A and B, consideration should also be given to the impacts of development of sites that are located in zone C, i.e. ‘down the hill’ flooding impacts, particularly in relation to areas which have suffered from flooding in the past, and are therefore known to be at risk of flooding and are not protected from existing for future flood relief schemes.</li> <li>• There should be no reliance in the zoning decision process on any potential protection from flood risk by proposed flood relief schemes, which cannot be relied upon until such time as they have received the appropriate consent and there is a commitment to their construction.</li> <li>• There are a number of proposed zoning changes which appear to propose development on sites which are located in and contributing to flows in the catchments drained by Drainage Districts, the maintenance responsibility for which lies with the local authority. There are a number of sites which are located in the areas considered to benefit from the improved drainage in the Drainage Districts, and these should be presumed to be at risk of flooding, pending a detailed site-specific flood risk assessment.</li> </ul>			

- The Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme and the Douglas and Togher Flood Relief Scheme are completed or in construction flood relief schemes in the area affected by the development plan and Proposed Variation No. 3. Care should be taken in the flood risk assessment for any changes to the zoning in these catchments.
- The Lower Lee Cork City flood relief scheme and the Blackpool River Bride flood relief scheme area proposed flood relief schemes in the area. There are developments proposed in these areas which may tend to increase flows in the watercourses in these areas, and this should be prevented through suitable controls and flood risk assessment in the zoning process as well as the development control process.
- Full use should be made of measures such as nature-based solutions (NBS), or sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS).
- The submission highlights the procedures under Section 50 of the Arterial Drainage Act of 1945 for any crossing of watercourses.
- There are lands in the Curraheen Catchment proposed for rezoning; current flood information needs to be carefully considered in any flood risk assessment carried out for these sites, and in the development of any undeveloped sites in this area.
- NE 2 partially overlaps with the site identified for upstream flood storage in the proposed Blackpool Flood Relief Scheme – the boundary of NE 2 should be altered.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 7

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Angelique Cashman</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission objects to the proposed rezoning of lands adjacent to Millboro, Kerry Pike, under Proposed Variation No. 3 to the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, citing significant concerns regarding the capacity of the area to accommodate further development.

It notes that while Kerry Pike has experienced substantial residential growth in recent years, this has not been matched by corresponding improvements in critical infrastructure and local services. As a result, the area is considered to be already over capacity, with existing residents experiencing increasing pressure on roads, safety, and accessibility.

The submission highlights several ongoing issues, including poor road conditions, traffic congestion, speeding, lack of footpaths and traffic calming measures, and the absence of public transport. These deficiencies are seen as contributing to dangerous conditions for both pedestrians and motorists, with particular concern expressed about road safety and the risk of serious accidents. It concludes that no further housing development should be permitted unless and until significant and demonstrable upgrades to local infrastructure are delivered in advance.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>The McCarthy Family</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	----------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

The submission proposes to rezone lands at Lauriston Hill, Ballyvolane from their current ZO 20 Hinterland designation to a combination of ZO 14 Institutions & Community for the Lauriston House demesne core and its proper curtilage, and ZO 2 New Residential

Neighbourhoods for the balance of the lands. It states that the full extent of the Lauritson holding should be incorporated into the variation to enable a consolidated and holistic approach to development, including facilitating southern access where the lands interface with the preferred route of the Northern Distributor Road. The submission asserts that the Lauritson lands are of strategic importance for unlocking the wider Ballyvolane Strategic Growth Area, both in terms of residential capacity and strategic access, and it highlights what it considers to be an inconsistency between the treatment of these lands and the proposed ZO 2 zoning of the NE4 site at Lotamore to the south of the Old Youghal Road.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 29

Submission No.	469	From:	Killens Community Residents group
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission represents a collective objection from residents of Killeens to the proposed rezoning of lands at Zoning Ref NW 1 from City Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhoods. While not opposed to housing in principle, the residents argue that the rezoning is premature and unsupported by evidence demonstrating adequate infrastructure, safe access, and necessary services.</p> <p>In particular, there is strong concern about any reliance on Seanabothair or Lios Cara as access routes, as these are existing residential estate roads not designed to accommodate significant additional traffic, with potential implications for road safety, emergency access, and overall residential amenity.</p> <p>The submission highlights existing pressures on the local road network, water supply issues, lack of services such as shops, schools, and public transport, and the likelihood of increased car dependency. It also raises concerns about construction impacts, public safety, and antisocial behaviour, as well as the cumulative effect of further development on an already constrained area. The residents request that the rezoning be refused unless comprehensive assessments are carried out and demonstrate that infrastructure, services, and access arrangements can safely support development.</p> <p>Should the rezoning proceeds, they seek strict safeguards, including prohibition of access through existing estates, confirmation of infrastructure capacity, and requirements for detailed transport, safety, and community impact assessments.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 30			

Submission No.	470	From:	Michael & Maura Cremen
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>This submission seeks the rezoning of additional residential lands at Knocknacorbally, Blarney, to support accelerated housing delivery in line with national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The submission identifies the lands as strategically important due to their serviced status, proximity to infrastructure and amenities, and their ability to address shortfalls in housing delivery.</p>			

The proposal it is stated is aligned to the revised National Planning Framework, which targets significant population growth and requires a major increase in housing output, alongside the identification of additional serviced and serviceable lands.

The submission opines that there is a persistent gap between housing targets and actual completions since 2022, particularly in Blarney, where a shortage of Tier 1 serviced lands has constrained development. Existing zoned lands are not delivering anticipated outputs, reinforcing the case for additional zoning.

It identifies Blarney as well-positioned for growth, with adequate infrastructure, public transport, and community facilities.

The subject lands it states are considered capable of delivering approximately 120–150 residential units, with no significant environmental, infrastructural, or legal constraints.

It further elaborates by stating that servicing capacity is largely confirmed, with only minor wastewater upgrades anticipated.

The site is described as contiguous to the existing built-up area, partially developed, and aligned with compact growth and infill development principles. It benefits from strong connectivity, including bus services and planned rail infrastructure, supporting transport-oriented development.

The submission states that the proposal is consistent with the Cork City Development Plan’s strategic objectives, particularly in relation to density, sustainable urban design, active travel, and green infrastructure. It also responds to strong market demand in Blarney, evidenced by rising house prices and its designation as a Rent Pressure Zone.

Overall, the submission concludes that the lands are suitable, deliverable in the short term (by circa 2028), and meet all relevant policy criteria, thereby supporting their rezoning for residential use.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 66

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Frances Holohan</b>
-----------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------

**Summary of Submission:**

Submission raises concerns that Kerry Pike’s infrastructure is already inadequate for its current population, and that rezoning land for approximately 80 additional homes would intensify existing pressures. The objection emphasises that development should not proceed until school capacity, footpaths, public transport, traffic-calming, and essential utilities are upgraded.

It is highlighted that the area is unsafe and inaccessible for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users, and families, with narrow roads, missing footpaths, and fast-moving traffic making everyday movement difficult. The submission argues that these conditions must be directly experienced to be understood, and that the idea of a “15-minute town” is unrealistic without substantial investment in local infrastructure.

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 31

Submission No.	472	From:	Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR)
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The OPR welcomes the overall approach to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025) (Housing Growth Guidelines) and the inclusion of updated core strategy tables identifying 270 hectares of new residential lands in Cork City in addition to the approximately 450 hectares of residential land that remain zoned and undeveloped in the current Development Plan. The approach taken in this proposed Variation reflects a focus on an incremental strategy that prioritises lands available for development in the short term, supporting the timely and effective delivery of new homes. The forthcoming 10-year development plan will present a valuable opportunity to build on this momentum through a more strategic approach, identifying how the city can expand at scale in a plan-led manner, and in alignment with public investment in infrastructure, particularly key transport projects under the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy 2040.</p> <p>The OPR also supports the long-term housing strategy and the release of three key strategic sites, including the 93 hectares Ballyvolane lands, an important step in enabling future growth.</p> <p>The submission makes <b>4 Recommendations</b>. The OPR requests planning authorities to implement or address any Recommendations to ensure consistency with the relevant policy and legislative provisions.</p> <p><b>Implementation of the Housing Growth Requirements</b></p> <p>The OPR request further detail in relation to the Core Strategy, city capacity audit and tiering.</p>			
<p><b>Recommendation 1 – Implementation of the Housing Growth Guidelines</b></p> <p><i>To ensure clarity within the core strategy, to support the coordinated and sustainable development of communities, and to the implementation of the housing growth requirements, and having considered the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the Development Plans, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022);</i></li> <li>• <i>the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025) (Housing Growth Guidelines), including Policy Objectives 1, 2 and 3 to incorporate the objectives of the Housing Growth Guidelines within development plans;</i></li> <li>• <i>NPO 43 of the NPF to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development;</i></li> <li>• <i>NPO 45 of the NPF to increase residential density in settlements; and</i></li> <li>• <i>NPO 101, 102 and 103 of the NPF to consider the serviceability of the land zoned for development;</i></li> </ul> <p><i>the Planning Authority is recommended to;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <i>revise and update new tables 2.3A and 2.4A as part of the variation to combine housing figures of the National Planning Framework First Revision (2025) uplift and the existing Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 core strategy tables data for both Tier 1, Tier 2 and long term strategic residential lands proposed including up to date information for City Docks and Tivoli Docks;</i></li> <li>(ii) <i>provide a Settlement Capacity Audit (SCA) to include an examination of all new residential zonings, zoning objective ZO 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, ZO 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods, ZO 3 and update residential zonings and prioritise all serviceable lands;</i></li> <li>(iii) <i>provide details of the quantum (ha), density and housing yield (units) of each new Residential Tier 1 or Tier 2 zonings; and</i></li> </ol>			

*(iv) following the outcome of the SCA, clarify that the NE 6 Ballyvolane and NE 8 Lauriston Hill/ Rathcooney lands, currently zoned ZO 3 Long Term Strategic Regeneration lands, will be released as part of the proposed Variation.*

### **Delivering Sustainable Communities and Compact Growth**

The OPR strongly welcomes the inclusion of the Site-Specific Zoning Objectives to the proposed Variation as an approach to managing key site constraints and requirements in the interests of transparency and to ensure the variation is coherent and legible. The OPR strongly supports the vision and principle of new residential strategic expansions to north and west of Cork City, and welcomes the background information provided through this variation. Given the importance and scale of these and other areas, the OPR considers however that these main urban expansions would benefit from a more comprehensive spatial framework to ensure the delivery of high quality, sustainable residential communities, supported by the timely provision of infrastructure. The OPR references the strategic lands at Carrigrohane and the density requirements set out in the Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Compact Settlements Guidelines).

#### **Recommendation 2 – Delivering Sustainable Communities and Compact Growth**

*In order to deliver compact growth and support the co-ordinated and sustainable development of communities, and having considered the following:*

- *NPO 8 and 10 of the NPF and RPO 10 of the RSES to deliver compact growth;*
- *NPO 45 of the NPF to increase residential density in settlements;*
- *NPO 17 and 43 of the NPF for provide for balanced, proportionate and sustainable growth, regeneration and renewal, and the alignment of investment in infrastructure, employment and supporting amenities and services;*
- *the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2015, as amended, mandatory target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 51%, the Climate Action Plan 2025 and associated actions including the national Sustainable Mobility Policy (2022) targets to reduce vehicle kilometres travelled per year and the National Investment Framework for Transport in Ireland (2021);*
- *the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), (sections 4.2, 4.3); and*
- *the Planning Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025),*

*the Office recommends that the Planning Authority:*

- (i) provide a new Site-Specific Objective for the South Ballincollig area at section 10.220 which includes the preparation of a strategic planning framework with integrated route alignment for the South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor of proposed residential zoning objectives SW 9 Greenfields Road, SW 10 Ballincollig (north M22), SW 11 Maglin, SW 12 Maglin, South Ballincollig;*
- (ii) revise the City Suburbs Objective 10.77 Ballyvolane to include the preparation of a planning framework for NE 6 for Ballyvolane Lands, including lands at NE 4 Lotamore and NE 8 Lauriston Hill, setting out the wider context of these lands within the north west of Cork City, including the provision of open space and green infrastructure corridors to edge and internally, reflecting proposed public transport routes and active travel linkages and integration with existing walking and cycling networks, as well as provision of school site campus and social infrastructure;*
- (iii) provide Delivery and Implementation Plans both for the lands at NE 6 Ballyvolane, NE 4 Lotamore and NE 8 Lauriston Hill and lands at South Ballincollig, including SW 9, SW 10, SW11 and SW12 with indicative timelines with a commitment to*

*carry out a detailed engagement process with key prescribed bodies and stakeholders including the National Transport Authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland, Office of Public Works, Uisce Éireann and the Department of Education to develop an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment;*

- (iv) include a commitment for the preparation of a high-level strategic planning framework for Long term Strategic Development Lands at Carrigrohane which provides a more strategic and comprehensive approach including consideration of all lands surrounding the wider context of Sites A - D which and demonstrates how major Transport Oriented Development lands/public transport infrastructure and strategic open space provision will be integrated;*
- (v) review proposed residential zoning NE 5 Upper Glanmire and Site-Specific Objective 12 and include new specific site objective which addresses the need to provide high quality integrated transport infrastructure and demonstrates community benefit;*
- (vi) review proposed residential zoning NE 1 Sallybrook and include a new Site-Specific Objective which addresses the need to provide high quality integrated transport infrastructure; and*
- (vii) provide a table indicating updated density range requirements for Cork City for City Central, City fringe, Inner Urban Suburbs, Outer suburbs and Hinterlands as required by Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).*

### **Integration of Transport and Land-Use Planning and the Strategic Road Network**

The OPR notes that a number of proposed zoning objectives are located adjacent to major strategic national road infrastructure including the N40, N22 and N28 surrounding Cork City, and recommends that the planning authority take due account of the implications of providing development in close proximity to the strategic road network by providing appropriate Site-Specific Objectives at zoning objectives SE 5, SW 3 and SW 10 in order to protect the physical integrity and operation of the N40 and N22.

The OPR has concerns that the proposed zoning objectives have the potential to undermine the progression of major future road infrastructure projects such as the proposed Cork City Northern Transport Project (NW 3 Kerry Pike) and the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project Scheme, (NW 6 Ringwood, Blarney), the Office recommends the Planning Authority reviews and where necessary omits two sites from the variation NW 3 Kerry Pike and NW 6 Ringwood, Blarney to ensure future route protection. The OPR also references proposed new zonings in the Moneygourney, Castletreasure and Mount Oval and their proximity to the M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Motorway Scheme, with concerns regarding the potential impact of additional traffic on the national road infrastructure and the need to support these additional zoning lands with active travel and public transport modal shift options.

The OPR also notes that the proposed major road and public transport projects in Cork City are referenced in the proposed variation but are not spatially mapped on a composite map or series of maps in the proposed variation.

#### **Recommendation 3 – Integration of Transport and Land Use Planning**

*Having regard to the need to maintain the carrying capacity and safety of the strategic road network, and having considered the following;*

- *NPO 107 of the NPF, (alignment of the National Planning Framework First Revision (2025) and the National Development Plan) NSO 1 (Compact Growth) and NSO 2 (Enhanced Regional Accessibility) of the NPF;*
- *RPO 140 of the RSES (international connectivity);*

- *RPO 151 and 154 of the RSES (integration of land use and transport planning);*
- *RPO 166 of the RSES (strategic inter regional multi modal connectivity to Metropolitan Areas and Economic Corridors);*
- *Cork Metropolitan Area Spatial Plan (MASP) Policy Objective 9 (strategic road network improvements); and*
- *sections 2.9 of Section 28 Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012), in respect of the policy approach for access to national roads,*

*the Office recommends that the Planning Authority;*

- (i) review and where necessary omit proposed zoning objectives (i) NW 3 Kerry Pike, (ii) NW 6 Ringwood where compatibility with the delivery and implementation of the Cork City Northern Transport project and Cork N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project Scheme cannot be demonstrated;*
- (ii) provide new Site-Specific Objectives for (i) SE 5 Jacobs Island, (ii) SW 3 Sandbrook, Wilton, to protect the physical integrity and operation of the N40 and the provision of noise, air, dust and light mitigation measures for the protection of residential amenity;*
- (iii) include a Site-Specific Objective 7 for SW 10, Ballincollig (north of N22), to protect the physical integrity and operation of the N22 and the provision of noise, air, dust and light mitigation measures for the protection of residential amenity;*
- (iv) include a Site-Specific Objective for (i) SE 6 Moneygurney, Douglas, (ii) SE 3 Castletreasure, Douglas (iii) SE 2 Moneygurney, Douglas, to prepare an overall traffic and transportation framework for existing and emerging residential areas of Moneygurney/Castletreasure/Mount Oval; and*
- (v) provide a clearly legible composite map/series of maps that clearly identify the existing and proposed road infrastructure network, the proposed Cork Northern Multi Modal Distributor Road, South Ballincollig Sustainable Transport Corridor, and proposed Luas Cork line and associated stops, Busconnects and all the existing and proposed active travel and public transport networks relative to the existing and proposed residential land use zonings for Cork City.*

*The Planning Authority should engage with the National Transport Authority and Transport Infrastructure Ireland in relation to the above.*

### **Flood Risk Management**

The OPR makes reference to an area of flooding identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) carried out for Proposed Variation No. 3 in proposed zoning site NE 6 and states that only river and coastal flooding must be identified, not groundwater flooding. The OPR requests that the planning authority sets out how increases in flood risk due to climate change can be managed proposed zoning sites SE 5 Jacob’s Island, Mahon and SW 7 Lands adjacent to Ballincollig.

The OPR notes that there are a number of benefiting lands or Drainage District channels in the vicinity of seven proposed zonings in this variation, there is a need for the planning authority to be ensure access requirements are preserved for the maintenance of these channels. Furthermore, such lands are prone to flooding and as such site-specific flood risk assessments may be required in these areas at development management stage.

The OPR notes that there are also a number of locations where new zonings are proposed which have unmapped watercourses adjacent or transversing through the lands. Stage 1 and 2 assessments are needed to investigate a potential source of flooding and consider if sufficient information is available to assess and classify the level of fluvial risk present, and

potentially Stage 3 assessments. The OPR further recommends that the planning authority should take account of the opportunities for nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and provide other benefits to water quality and biodiversity.

**Recommendation 4 - Flood Risk Management**

*Having regard to flood risk management, and having considered:*

- *NPO 78 of the NPF (avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding that do not pass the Plan making Justification Test (Justification Test));*
- *RPO 116 of the RSES to consider future appropriate land-use policies in accordance with the requirements of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) (Flood Guidelines); and*
- *the Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) (Flood Guidelines);*

*the Office recommends that the Planning Authority:*

- (i) review flood risk at proposed zoning NE 6 Ballyvolane based on river and coastal flooding only and remove areas of risk which are based on groundwater flooding;*
- (ii) review mid range future scenario mapping for proposed zonings SE 5 Jacob’s Island, Mahon and SW 7 Ballincollig and set out how increases in flood risk due to climate change can be managed on the site;*
- (iii) review and carry out site specific flood risk assessments where necessary on the following sites adjoining Drainage District channels; (i) SW 3 Sandbrook, Wilton, (ii) SW 8 Flynn’s Road and Castle Road, Ballincollig, (iii) SW 9 Greenfields Road, Ballincollig, (iv) SW 10 north of N22, Ballincollig, (v) SW 11 Maglin, South Ballincollig (vi) SW 12 Maglin South Ballincollig, (vii) LTS D Scotch Lane, Carrigrohane;*
- (iv) carry out risk assessments to determine if stage 3 flood risk assessments are required on the following proposed residential zonings; (i) SE 3 Castletreasure, Douglas, (ii) SE 6 Moneygurney, (iii) SW 1 Lehenaghmore (iv) SW 3 Sandbrook, Wilton, (v) NE 7 Cúil Chluthair, Glanmire, (vi) NW 6 Ringwood, Blarney along either side of unmapped watercourses and which have no flood risk extents illustrated on the flood zoning mapping. If required, the planning authority should undertake stage 3 flood risk assessments and if necessary rezone lands for an appropriate use consistent with the Flood Guidelines;*
- (v) ensure the management of surface water run-off in the development of key sites is in accordance with Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) including nature-base solutions. These sites should be identified in the SFRA and necessary guidance provided on the applicability of different SuDs techniques.*
- (vi) points raised at (ii) to (v) should be included as Site-Specific Objectives to the relevant proposed zonings at section 10.10 as appropriate.*

*The Planning Authority should consult with OPW in addressing this recommendation.*

**Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 1

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tony Looney &amp; Edward Carey</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission requests that the lands at Ballinveitig, Curraheen, Bishopstown be rezoned from Hinterland to New Residential Neighbourhood (ZO2), or at minimum designated for future residential use.</p> <p>The justification centres on the argument that the current draft of Variation No. 3 overstates the amount of genuinely deliverable residential land, noting that “a substantial proportion of these lands do not represent net new greenfield or opportunity regeneration sites capable of strategic residential delivery” and that “approximately 100 hectares... would not support any substantial residential housing output.”</p> <p>The submission further argues that the subject lands are strategically located, serviced, unconstrained, and capable of short-term delivery, emphasising their proximity to the proposed Cork Luas corridor and existing high-frequency public transport.</p> <p>It states that retaining the Hinterland designation is “inconsistent with national and regional policy... and with the original intent of the city boundary extension.”</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 67			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Tralena Hyslop</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submitter acknowledges the need for increased housing supply in Cork and supports sustainable development, however objects to the rezoning of the land in Moneygourney, Douglas for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration that the proposed rezoning is not aligned with the Development Plan’s key principles of infrastructure led growth and Section 28 of the National Planning Guidelines which emphasise growth must be matched by timely supporting infrastructure. It is considered that the Douglas/Rochestown area’s infrastructure capacity is already under pressure in relation to recreational space, congestion, road safety local schools and services, with a continuing reduction in accessible green and amenity space. Concerns are outlined that this has led to children shifting to using residential roads for informal play and outdoor activities leading them to being in close proximity to moving vehicles.</li> <li>• Concerns are raised regarding the required upkeep by locals of their estate which they believe to be owned by the Cork City Council, but they tend to give the lack of structured, accessible recreational infrastructure for children in the area.</li> <li>• Concerns that the site forms part of the broader ecological network and that rezoning it would contradict both the City’s Development Plan and national biodiversity protection objectives.</li> <li>• It is considered that with the current Development Plan not being scheduled for review until 2029, proposals of this scale would benefit from a fuller assessment within the normal planning cycle to ensure adequate strategic review and public consultation as the rezoning in its current form is premature.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 18			

Submission No.	475	From:	Lios Cara Estate Residents, Killeens
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission from residents of Lios Cara Estate raises strong objections to the proposed rezoning of lands at Killeens (NW1), arguing that it is premature and unsustainable given significant existing infrastructure deficits. Residents highlight that the area currently lacks adequate road capacity, public transport, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, as well as essential services such as schools, childcare, healthcare, and retail provision. There are also serious concerns regarding water supply reliability and wastewater infrastructure, with reference to acknowledged capacity constraints and the need for substantial upgrades. It is argued that rezoning in advance of addressing these issues would be contrary to national and local planning policy.</p> <p>A key issue relates to traffic safety and the suitability of existing residential roads, particularly Lios Cara and Seanabóthair, to accommodate additional development traffic. Residents strongly object to any proposal that would use these estate roads as access routes, noting they were designed for low-density residential use and currently serve vulnerable users including children and elderly residents.</p> <p>The submission states that their concerns are compounded by the fact that Lios Cara Estate has not been taken in charge and remains incomplete, with deficiencies in roads, footpaths, signage, and safety measures.</p> <p>The submission stresses that the estate infrastructure is not fit to accommodate increased traffic and that its use as an access corridor would pose unacceptable safety risks.</p> <p>The submission also highlights longstanding road safety concerns in the wider area, including a failure to implement previously required mitigation measures such as a mini-roundabout at Seanabóthair.</p> <p>This has undermined community confidence in the Council’s ability to enforce planning conditions and deliver infrastructure commitments. In addition, concerns are raised about pressure on water and wastewater systems, with calls for detailed capacity assessments and confirmation that all necessary upgrades are funded and delivered prior to any development proceeding.</p> <p>Deficiencies in community infrastructure and amenity provision are also emphasised, with residents noting the lack of adequate recreational facilities, green space, and social infrastructure. Particular concern is expressed regarding the potential loss or reduction of existing green space within Lios Cara if road access were to be facilitated through the estate, which could result in non-compliance with planning standards and a reduction in residential amenity and quality of life. The importance of green infrastructure for health, wellbeing, and community cohesion is strongly underscored.</p> <p>Overall, the submission calls for the rejection of the proposed rezoning, or alternatively the inclusion of robust, enforceable safeguards.</p> <p>These include prohibiting access through existing estates, requiring delivery of new distributor road infrastructure, and undertaking comprehensive assessments covering transport, infrastructure capacity, environmental impacts, and community needs.</p> <p>The submission highlights the need for a Community Infrastructure Plan, and insists that all necessary physical, social, and environmental supports must be clearly planned, funded, and delivered in advance of any future development.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 30			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Department of Education of Youth</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission notes the updated housing and population targets set out in Proposed Variation No. 3 and notes that the delivery of these targets will increase demand for school places and put pressure on existing schools, and states that the Department’s preference is to expand existing facilities where possible to meet the additional demand.</p> <p>The submission outlines the potential impact of Proposed Variation No. 3 on a number of settlements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North-east suburbs: at least 3 primary schools and 1 post-primary school will be required. The submission notes that the Department will engage further with Cork City Council in relation to Objective 10.77 “Ballyvolane Long-term Strategic Regeneration Lands” (as amended in Proposed Variation No. 3) and lands zoned “ZO 3 Long Term Strategic Regeneration”.</li> <li>• North-west suburbs: increased primary and post-primary demand could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• South-east suburbs: site reservation for school facilities or the expansion of existing facilities may be required for the provision of 1-2 primary schools to meet the target growth. Increased demand for post-primary facilities could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• South-west suburbs: site reservation for school facilities or the expansion of existing facilities may be required for the provision of primary school places to meet the target growth. Increased demand for post-primary facilities could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• Ballincollig: at least 1 primary school required and the potential for an additional post-primary school.</li> <li>• Blarney: 1 primary school and expansion of existing post-primary facilities required.</li> <li>• Glanmire: increased primary and post-primary demand could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• Kerry Pike: increased primary and post-primary demand could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• Killeens: increased primary and post-primary demand could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> <li>• Upper Glanmire: increased primary and post-primary demand could be met by the expansion of existing facilities.</li> </ul> <p>The submission notes that schools are enabling infrastructure for housing, located in the heart of new and expanding sustainable communities, and other community facilities and amenities should be positioned close to school facilities to allow complimentary community uses to be located in proximity to each other. All enabling infrastructure should be provided in advance of the need for such schools. The submission also notes that additional Special Education Needs (SEN) provision at both primary and post primary level will be required in the future which will result in schools requiring additional accommodation space. The Department will advise Cork City Council if and when sites for future special schools are required at specific locations. The submission also notes that in terms of assessing current and future capacity unforeseen circumstances can also impact on school capacity, such as the Ukraine crisis, and could necessitate the reassessment of school provision from time to time.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 17			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Adrian Conlon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission highlights that when BMOR Developments submitted a masterplan with their application for residential zoning, that they included a parcel of the submitter’s land as greenspace/park. However, the submission contends that this land is not available to BMOR to be used as open space. A requirement for greenspace/openspace has been identified for the area, and BMOR’s application should not be an exception. Submission provides background to the land noting that it was zoned residential at one time (at the Apple end), but that it was subsequently dezoned during the recession. Submission notes that it could be an automatic choice for rezoning back to residential.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 68			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Kenneth O'Donovan</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission proposes rezoning a portion of the lands (383 sq m) at O’Mahony’s Avenue/Grattan Hill zoned Z0 15 Public Open Space to Z0 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. It submits that the subject lands are steeply sloped and unsuitable for use as functional public open space and are further in private ownership and not accessible as public amenity lands. The rezoning is proposed to allow integration with the residentially-zoned lands to the south to improve site layout/consolidate the residential zoning envelope. It is submitted that this would enable a more appropriate at grade access point from the residential lands to the open space and would further contribute to passive surveillance of the open space.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 69			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Gavan Barrett</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Concern is expressed that infrastructure in Lehenaghmore is already inadequate, with daily traffic congestion. Further zoning or development is viewed as likely to worsen these conditions, with many feeling that the impact on the area is not being properly considered.</p> <p>It is emphasised that these points come from direct experience of current pressures, and reflect a genuine understanding of how additional building would affect the community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Niamh Barrett</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission states that the existing road infrastructure is already operating beyond capacity, and further development will significantly worsen conditions. With most households now owning two or more vehicles, any additional housing will lead to a substantial increase in traffic volumes. This will intensify current bottlenecks at Togher, Tramore Road, Wilton, and on routes affected by diversions from Farmers Cross and Airport Hill, all of which are already under severe pressure. Ongoing works are also causing extensive damage to the natural habitat, resulting in the loss of wildlife and environmental degradation. These issues should be fully considered as part of the planning process.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 20			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Paul Condon</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission from a resident of Sallybrook/Glanmire objecting to rezoning of lands above their home (NE1). The submission’s primary concern regards flooding; their home previously flooded during a period of high rainfall. The subject lands currently absorb significant surface water, but replacing them with roads/buildings will increase runoff toward existing homes. Concern is also raised regarding the environmental impact on what is a sensitive river and woodland habitat, home to bats and otters as reflected in the Natura Impact Statement for the Glashaboy Flood Relief Works. The land also provides a green space between the community and wider development. In addition, the submission raises concerns regarding the lack of adequate infrastructure and local services, including overcrowded schools, with traffic congestion already a problem. In summary, this is the wrong location for a concentrated development and the existing protection on these lands should be retained.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>National Transport Authority (NTA)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission sets out National Transport Authority’s (NTA) observations on the proposed land use changes insofar as they relate to their role as the agency responsible for public transport services planning and for funding of the national active travel programme. Additionally, the proposed land use changes have been reviewed against the transport infrastructure proposals presented in the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS).</p> <p>The National Transport Authority expressed concerns with the applied methodology and in particular the absence of a Settlement Capacity Audit and any related Chief Executive report associated with this assessment. The absence of these reports limits the assessment potential of the proposed sites, which are subject to the Variation, in terms of existing transport provision, planned transport infrastructure and the additional transport requirements required to serve the proposed new land zonings.</p>			

The submission provided observations and recommendations with respect to general transport planning requirements and the proposed land use rezonings.

**Connectivity and Filtered Permeability:** The NTA recommends that all proposed zoning amendments should be characterised by a high degree of permeability and connectivity for active modes, and that the development of adjacent sites should be guided by a master plan setting out the movement networks, access points and connections for active modes between the discrete sites.

**Transport Corridors and Reservations:** The NTA recommends that all route options related to major transport infrastructure schemes should be included in the maps of the proposed zoning amendments to highlight any potential overlaps between the scheme corridors and the proposed zonings, and that these corridors should be omitted from the proposed zoning of lands through which the schemes would run.

The NTA also recommends that, where route alignments have yet to be identified, the related sites should be zoned as Long-Term Strategic Development, pending the identification of route options.

**Proposed Zoning Amendments:** The NTA presented commentary on the following proposed zoning amendments contained within the Variation;

**SE 3 Castletreasure, Douglas, and SE 6 Moneygourney, Douglas:** The lands are located on the periphery of the city with limited connectivity and potential for effective public transport access. This will lead to higher car dependency with the potential to impact the national road which is contrary to the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities*.

**SE 4 Garryduff:** The NTA’s submission notes the peripheral location of the lands. The nearest bus service is the proposed route L46 which is low frequency in nature and not sufficient to support the proposed rezoning. The submission notes that the site is close to a higher frequency route (No. 9) travelling along Garryduff Road and noted that connectivity to this bus route is required.

**SW 1 Lehenaghmore (off Togher Road), SW 2 Lehenaghmore (east of Lehenaghmore Park) and SW 6 Spur Hill, Doughcloyne:** The NTA’s submission notes the peripheral location of the lands and their lack of connectivity with planned public transport services. Additionally, there is a requirement that the existing rural road network will require upgrading. The submission notes that SW 1 has the potential for active travel connectivity, but both SW 2 and SW 6 would be more challenging leading to a high level of car dependency.

**NE 2 Kilcully (off Kilcully Road) and NE 3 Kilcully (off Rosemount Estate):** The NTA’s submission notes the peripheral location of the lands and that the local road network is not suitable for active travel nor the delivery of high frequency bus routes. The NTA raised concerns with respect to high levels of car usage as a result.

**NE 4 Lotamore, NE 6 Ballyvolane and NE 8 Lauriston Hill, Rathcooney:** All three sites are located along the emerging preferred route of the Cork Northern Distributor Multi-Modal Route. The NTA recommends that the subject sites should be zoned as Long Term Strategic Development only, rather than New Residential or Long-Term Strategic Regeneration so as not to prejudice the future delivery of the scheme.

**NW 6 Ringwood Blarney:** The NTA submission noted the need to identify and develop active travel routes that would effectively connect the site to the planned Blarney Train Station.

**NW 7 Rathpeacon:** The site is located along the preferred route of the Cork Northern Distributor Multi-Modal Route. The NTA recommends that the subject site should be zoned as Long Term Strategic Development so as not to prejudice the future delivery of the scheme.

#### **Chief Executive’s Response & Recommendation:**

See Response Ref. 3

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Jonathan Burke</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>Submission objects to the proposed development (NE1) contending that it would fundamentally and negatively alter the peaceful character of the area and have a significant detrimental impact on residents' property, health, and the local environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction would involve a significant increase in heavy vehicle traffic, generating dust and noise, which could dirty/damage property and pose health risks such as respiratory problems/allergies/other health issues to residents, particularly children and the elderly.</li> <li>• The submitter lives in a cul-de-sac which is unsuitable for the type and volume of traffic that this development would bring. Access roads are narrow and were never designed to handle HGVs or a major increase in car traffic. This will lead to congestion, and safety risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and children.</li> <li>• The proposed development will have a lasting and severe impact on the local environment, with loss of peace and quiet from construction noise and increased traffic; disruption to local wildlife and habitats, leading to a net loss of biodiversity in the area; and an increase in pollution from traffic and construction.</li> </ul>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 24			

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Chloe McSweeney</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>			
<p>The submission raises concerns regarding the lack of facilities and services in Kerry Pike, noting that while housing development is ongoing, there is no local shop or public transport provision. It highlights increasing traffic congestion and reliance on private cars, particularly affecting younger residents’ mobility, and suggests that investment in basic amenities such as a bus service and local retail would better support the existing and growing community.</p>			
<b>Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendation:</b>			
See Response Ref. 31			