Planning and Integrated Development Directorate
Cork City Council
City Hall
Cork

23rd July 2026

RE: APPLICATION REGISTER REFERENCE 25/44406, APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION FOR LARGE-SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING THE DEVELOPMENT OF 323NO. DWELLING UNITS AND ALL OTHER ASSOCIATED SITE DEVELOPMENT WORKS ON A SITE AT RINGWOOD, SHEAN UPPER AND SHEAN LOWER, BLARNEY, CORK.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION DATED 18TH FEBRUARY 2026.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We, Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd. of NSC Campus, Mahon, Cork, are instructed by the applicants, Clockstrike Ltd., to respond to the Planning Authority's Request for Further Information (hereafter RFI) dated 18th February 2026 in respect to this Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) at Ringwood, Blarney, Cork City.

This request was subject to an extension of the appropriate period in accordance with Section 33(3) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

Our response, set out hereunder, has been informed by consultations with relevant Cork City Council personnel and follows the format of the RFI:

1. Material Contravention of the Cork City Development Plan, 2022 - 2028, as varied.

Please engage with the Planning Authority in relation to following a Material contravention process for this proposed development.

Response:
A Variation to the Cork City Development Plan, 2002 was made by Cork City Council on the 13th July 2026 and takes immediate effect. The Variation (No.3) included the rezoning of lands at Ringwood from ZO 20 - City Hinterland and Long-Term Strategic Development Land to ZO - 2 New Residential Neighbourhoods.

While the subject application site retains its initial zoning objectives, all key elements of hard infrastructure are now located on lands zoned ZO 2, where such development is permissible. The only element located within the City Hinterland ZO 20 zone is the proposed wetland amenity area.

Still, the wetland amenity is in keeping with the function of the City Hinterland as set out in paragraph 2.58 of the Plan, in that it:

- Reinforces the greenbelt preventing urban sprawl into the surrounding countryside;
- Enhances biodiversity, ecology and wildlife;
- Provides new green and blue infrastructure assets;
- Ensures a distinctive landscape character and setting within the Cork Metropolitan Area; and
- Protects the character and integrity of the city and its urban towns and settlements.

The wetland amenity use is therefore considered to be in keeping with both the intention of the City Hinterland zoning objective and the overall aims and objectives of the Development Plan.

At a broader Development Plan level, the concept of Placemaking as set out in the Plan is of particular relevance, requiring that *"Development proposals in every zone must have placemaking as a primary consideration and must demonstrate how the proposal would respect, reflect or contribute to the character and vibrancy of the particular neighbourhood, centre or area, commensurate with the nature and scale of the development."* (paragraph 12.19).

The Plan also calls for development proposals to deliver or contribute towards the quality of the urban environment and public realm, focusing on accessibility, pedestrian priority and permeability.

At paragraph 12.4, the Plan confirms that the various uses listed for each land use zoning are intended as a general guide and are not an exhaustive list. The Plan continues to state that other land uses may be permitted where:

- they would not have a detrimental impact on the primary land use zoning objective.
- they would be consistent with the relevant objectives and criteria set out in this Plan.
- there would not be any significant adverse impacts on-site or on the surrounding environment.

Paragraph 12.10 recognises the interdependencies between land use zones and calls for development proposals near zoning boundaries to give consideration to development in adjoining zones. This policy objective is particularly relevant to environmentally sensitive zones, such as the wetland amenity area.

The import of all the above Development Plan provisions is that there is significant flexibility in terms of how zoning objectives will be applied and the type of development that may be permitted within a relevant zoning, having regard to proximate development and zonings, the wider development plan and core strategy, and proper planning and sustainable development

The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the zoning objectives for the subject site and, consequently, a material contravention of the Development Plan does not arise.

In addressing this matter, and other RFI items, a number of design changes have been incorporated into the proposed development.

The application's red line to the eastern site boundary has been revised to be consistent with the N/M20 Project. It has been extended along the R617 to Castle Close Lawn, as requested by the Planning Authority, and it has been extended to capture the revised road alignments, wastewater proposals and surface water strategy.

In accordance with the revised wastewater strategy agreed with Uisce Éireann, the wastewater pumping station at the R617 has been removed and the permitted Phase 1 pumping station has been updated and extended to accommodate the proposed Phase 2 development. A new secondary pumping station for the Primary Care Centre is now included.

The Spine Road has been shortened to minimise its path through the wetwood public open space area, and a landscaped embankment is added to restrict vehicular access.

The gradients of the Spine Road have been amended to reflect the revised surface water strategy.

The finished floor levels (FFLs) for Apartment Blocks 1 and 2 have subsequently been amended to align with the newly adjusted Spine Road gradients. These revised road levels serve to reduce the vertical separation between the two buildings, bringing the relative elevations of Block 1 and Block 2 closer together.

Additionally, Duplex Blocks Types A-E have been redesigned to the new Duplex Blocks Types A-D, resulting in a reduction of 4no. dwellings (total 319no. dwellings as opposed to 323no. submitted). This results in minor modification to the proposed development's residential dwelling type mix and net residential density.

Plans illustrating these revisions are enclosed in Appendix 1 of this response. They are also addressed in the EIAR Addendum Report enclosed in Appendix 7.

2. Infrastructure Section

a. The proposed development extends over the indicative development boundary of the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project as published in June 2025. There are concerns that the proposed development will interfere with the earthworks and drainage design of the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project from Chainage 6,400 to 6,900 (N/M20 chainage reference). Given the above concerns and requirement for further consultation between the applicant and the N/M20 project team. Please address and provide written confirmation of consultation.

Response:

The red line boundary for the proposed development has been amended to account for the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project to ensure there is no overlap. This matter has been subject to ongoing consultation with the N20 design team to ensure that interactions at the eastern boundary of the subject site do not impact upon plans being advanced under the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project.

Written confirmation of consultation with the N/M20 Cork to Limerick Project Team is enclosed in Appendix 2.

b. There are conflicting details shown on the phase 2 application when comparing it with the Ringwood Phase 1 development. This is in particular evident in the internal layout and the layout of the junction with station road. The applicant needs to clarify this.

Response:

The Phase 2 site layout has been amended to reflect the Phase 1 design agreed though compliance submissions made to the Planning Authority. Confirmation that this design has been agreed was issued by the Planning Authority on the 2nd July 2026. Please see enclosed in Appendix 3.

c. The delivery timeline of the developments (various phases) on this and the surrounding sites should be clarified.

Response:

In terms of delivery, the Phase 1 permitted development is to commence work in September 2026 and will be carried out over a 2-year period. The completion of the houses is estimated for September 2027, while the remaining duplexes and apartment units are to be completed by September 2028.

Phase 2 works, subject to securing planning permission, are intended to commence in September 2027 and would again be subject to a 2-year build out, with the completion of houses by September 2028, the completion of duplexes in February 2029, and the completion of the apartments in September 2029. The build out of both phases will incorporate all associated site and infrastructure works.

d. External Connections

i. The main desire line for pedestrians and cyclists of the phase 2 development will be via station road. To enhance the pedestrian and cycling connectivity of the development provision of Active

Travel Facilities on Station Road from the development entrance on Station Road to the Junction of Station Road and the R617 should be provided by the development. The red line Boundary of the development needs to be extended to cover this in the event that Phase 2 commences in advance of Phase 1. This infrastructure should be delivered in advance of the development becoming operational. Details to be agreed with Cork City Council.

Response:

The detailed design of enhanced active travel infrastructure along Station Road between the entrance to the development and the R617, which were included within the Phase 1 development, have been agreed with Planning Authority through compliance with Condition No.5 of that permission (Application Reg. Ref. 24/43031, Appeal Case Ref. ABP-321688-25).

Confirmation that active travel measures are agreed was issued by the Planning Authority on the 2nd July 2026. These works will be carried out in Phase 1A of the construction programme and shall be completed prior to the occupation of any residential unit.

ii. ***The applicant is to submit details of traffic calming on the approach to the Killard Road Junction from the N20 and these proposals should be incorporated into the design. This infrastructure should be delivered in advance of the development becoming operational. Details to be agreed with Cork City Council.***

Response

Through meetings with Cork City Council's (CCC) Transportation Department, it was agreed that an uncontrolled pedestrian/cycle crossing will be provided on the greenway/footpath crossing on the R617, approximately 60 meters to the east of the Killard Road junction, and that these works would form part of the CCC active travel scheme to be implemented on the R617.

iii. ***To enhance the pedestrian and cycling connectivity of the development and in particular the Primary Health Care Centre, the red line boundary should be extended from the Development Entrance on the R617 to the Junction of the R617 and Castle Close Lawn. Connection for Pedestrians and Cyclists should be provided from the Development Entrance on the R617 to the Junction of the R617 and Castle Close Lawn. This includes the lands included in the blue line boundary identified in the drawings supplied by the applicant. This infrastructure should be delivered in advance of the development becoming operational. Details of this connection are to be supplied by the applicant and agreed with Cork City Council.***

Response

The red line site boundary of the proposed development has been extended from the Development Entrance on the R617 to the Junction of the R617 and Castle Close Lawn with enhanced pedestrian and cyclist connections provided. Details of the design of road improvements along the R617, from the Castle Close Lawn junction to the Killard Junction, have been subject to consultations with the Planning Authority

and agreed in principle. The planning application already includes a letter of consent from the City Council. Please see enclosed revised drawings detailing these revisions in Appendices 1 and 2.

iv. Pedestrian and cycling connection to all adjacent housing estates should be allowed for. This includes for the potential to connect to: Ard na Greine, Assumption Terrace and Aisling Geal.

Response

Pedestrian and cycling connections to Ard na Greine and Aisling Geal have been provided in the design. Connections to Assumption Terrace are not considered necessary from a connectivity and accessibility point of view, with residents most likely to use the proposed new junction on Station Road.

v. In the interest of road safety, traffic calming measures are to be provided on the R617. Locations and details of these are to be provided.

Response

Travelling westbound on the R617 from the N20 interchange, the proposed new signal-controlled junctions at the Killard Road and proposed development will be spaced circa 250 meters apart. The relatively close spacing of these signal-controlled junctions, in tandem with the implementation of enhanced active travel facilities along this road, will help regulate traffic flows on the R617.

It should be noted that the Road Safey Audit undertaken for these works on the R617 did not identify any specific safety concerns or the need to implement additional traffic calming measures. Considering the above, it is therefore considered that no additional traffic calming need be implemented on the R617.

vi. Further details are needed on the Proposed Development Entrance onto the R617 Western approach lead in taper lengths and visibility to the primary traffic signals of this are to be provided.

Response

As discussed, and agreed in principle with CCC Transportation Department, a 1:10 flare length for the right turn lane heading into the development is considered appropriate in an urban context. In addition, it is noted that the Road Safey Audit undertaken for the development junction did not identify the flare length as a point of concern.

Drawing BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01163 in Appendix 2 illustrates the forward sight visibility on approach to the traffic signal heads from the R617 and the development spine road. In accordance with Table 4.2 of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, sufficient Forward sight Visibility for the design speed of the Road (SSD of 49metres on a 50kph Road) has been achieved.

vii. Planting on the western approach to the Proposed Development Entrance onto the R617 is to be set back sufficiently from the road edge so as to facilitate the tie-in of the enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities to the West of the development.

Response

As indicated on Drawing Nos. BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01161 through to BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01165 in Appendix 2, planting on the western approach to the proposed development entrance onto the R617 has been set back sufficiently from the road edge so as to facilitate the tie-in of the enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities.

viii. Taper lengths of the right turn lanes on the R617 are to be provided by the developer. The Length of these are to be agreed with Cork City Council.

Response

As detailed in response to item 2.d.vi above and agreed in principle with CCC Transportation Department, a 1:10 flare length for the right turn lanes on the R617 has been provided. This is considered an appropriate flare length for a signal-controlled junction in an urban setting.

e. Internal Network:

i. The information received to verify that the slope along the spine road within the development is not legible. This should be provided in a legible manner to inform the provision of rest areas for mobility impaired users and to ensure the development is as age friendly as possible.

Response

An updated drawing illustrating the vertical alignment of the development spine road is provided on Drawing Nos. BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-00704 and BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-00705 in Appendix 2. In accordance with the Design Manual for Urban Roads & Streets and the National Cycle Manual, 'the vertical design of the road does not exceed a 5% gradient.

The gradients of the Spine Road have been amended to reflect the revised surface water strategy. The finished floor levels (FFLs) for Apartment Blocks 1 and 2 have subsequently been amended to align with the newly adjusted Spine Road gradients. These revised road levels serve to reduce the vertical separation between the two buildings, bringing the relative elevations of Block 1 and Block 2 closer together.

ii. Not sufficient information received/legible to verify that the alignment of the Cycle Facilities is in line with the Cycle Design manual for both horizontal and vertical alignment.

Response

As illustrated on Drawing Nos. BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01150 through BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01166 and BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-00700 to BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-00711 in Appendix 2, the horizontal and vertical design of the cycle facilities, have been designed in accordance with the NTA's National Cycle Manual (NCM). With reference to Table 4.7 of the NCM, the desirable

minimum radius of 94m is achieved on all sections of cycle track and with reference to Table 4.10, the Absolute Maximum Gradient of 5% is not exceeded on any section of cycle track.

iii. In the interest of road safety traffic calming measures are to be provided along the spine route. Locations and details of these are to be provided.

Response

Revisions to the design of the Spine Road have been discussed and agreed in principle with CCC Transportation Department. Please see enclosed revised drawings detailing these revisions in Appendix 2. The spacing of the junctions and method of control (signalised for the main junctions) have been carefully considered to help maintain a low-speed environment along the entire length of the spine road, whilst facilitating access to future development lands.

As the road will be used as a bus route to the train station and Stoneview in the future, the implementation of vertical traffic calming (ramps) along this road is not considered appropriate. This approach is consistent with the recommendation of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets.

Notwithstanding the above, it is recommended that traffic speeds be monitored on the Spine Road, following Phase 2 construction (within 6-months) and that temporary ramps then be implemented should average speeds exceed 50kph or safety concerns be raised at that stage.

iv. In the interest of road safety raised crossings to cater for pedestrians and cyclists are to be provided along the spine road at pedestrian and cyclist desire lines. Locations and details of these crossings are to be in accordance with DMURS, the Cycle Design Manual, and to be agreed with Cork City Council.

Response

As illustrated on Drawing Nos. BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01150 through BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01166 in Appendix 2, signal-controlled pedestrian crossings have been provided along the spine road at main junctions and midblock along key desire lines.

v. Raised pedestrian and cycle crossing points and priority is to be given across internal junctions.

Response

As illustrated on the Proposed Spine Road Phase 2 drawings in Appendix 2, appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossing points have been provided across junctions internal to the development.

vi. The developer is to propose measures at the northeastern corner of the project to deter anti-social behaviour and long-term parking. Details of this is to be agreed with Cork City Council.

Response:

As illustrated on Drawing Nos. BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01162 and BLR-2-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-MHL-CE-01163 in Appendix 2, and agreed in principle with CCC Transportation Department, the length of spur on the development spine road has been revised in order to deter anti-social behaviour and long-term parking.

f. Quality Audit:

i. It is acknowledged that a quality audit was submitted and carried out by an external consultant and the measures recommended by the Auditor need to be reflected on the drawings.

ii. Further Stages of Road Safety and Quality Audits are to be carried out on the Detailed Design, Construction and Operational Stages. Amendments as a result of these audits are to be carried.

Response:

Noted. Subject to the granting of planning permission, further audits will be carried out on the detailed design, construction and operational stages. The applicants are open to appropriate planning conditions requiring same.

3. Roads, Active Travel and Safety – Station Road/R617 Corridor

Ringwood Phase 1 Development:

This Request for Further Information is issued having regard to the submitted drawings and reports, including the Option Selection Report and subsequent site context review based on Street View imagery (Aug 2022 and Oct 2021). The images demonstrate recurring physical constraints along Station Road and the R617 village corridor which materially affect the feasibility and safety of the proposed cycle and shared pedestrian/cycle infrastructure.

i. R617 Village Corridor: Bus Priority and Cycle Compatibility

a. Demonstrate how proposed cycle facilities integrate safely with existing bus priority lanes.

b. Clarify whether cyclists are intended to share bus lanes, be segregated, or be diverted to shared space.

c. Demonstrate compliance with DMURS place-based design principles for village centres.

ii. Station Road (Southern Section}: Absence of Continuous Footpaths

a. Demonstrate how pedestrians and cyclists are safely accommodated where footpaths are intermittent or absent.

b. Clarify whether shared pedestrian/cycle facilities are proposed in these constrained sections.

c. Demonstrate that pedestrians are not placed in close proximity to live traffic lanes.

iii. Station Road (Residential Section): On-Street Parking and Effective Width Loss

a. Demonstrate effective available width for cyclists where on-street parking is present.

b. Clarify whether parking removal or restriction is proposed.

c. Demonstrate how cyclist dooring risk and forced lateral deviation are avoided.

iv. Boundary Walls, Railings and Drainage Pinch Points

- ***a. Identify all locations where fixed features reduce width below minimum standards.***
- ***b. Demonstrate how each pinch point is resolved in the proposed design.***
- ***c. Where unresolved, justify any departure from DMURS and the National Cycle Manual.***

v. Continuity and Coherence of Cycle Provision

- ***a. Demonstrate a continuous, coherent and legible cycle route along Station Road and into the R617.***
- ***b. Identify all locations requiring cyclists to merge, share space, or deviate from desire lines.***
- ***c. Provide a corridor-wide compliance matrix against DMURS and the National Cycle Manual.***

vi. Pedestrian Connectivity & Crossings

Non-compliance with DMURS Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.5 regarding pedestrian permeability, desire lines, and controlled crossing provision. Proposed layouts do not provide continuous footpath widths greater than or equal to 2.0 m nor safe crossing points at junctions and bus stops.

vii. Cyclist Provision & Pinch Points

Conflicts identified contrary to NCM Chapter 4 and GOA Cycle Manual Section 1.3.4. Carriageway narrowing on Station Road and the R617 creates pinch points below minimum operating widths, forcing cyclists into mixed traffic.

viii. Bus Priority & Parking Interaction

Inconsistent with DMURS Section 4.4 and BusConnects principles. On street parking and loading near junctions undermines bus reliability and cyclist safety.

ix. Junction Geometry & Traffic Calming

Junction radii and approach speeds are not aligned with DMURS Section 4.6 and 4.7. Insufficient vertical deflection (raised tables) provided at key pedestrian crossing points.

x. Storm Sewer & Drainage Network

Potential non-compliance with GDSDS and OPW CFRAM objectives. Increased impermeable areas without demonstrated capacity checks or attenuation strategy.

xi. Road Safety & Visibility

Stopping sight distances and forward visibility appear inconsistent with DMURS Table 3.3. Vegetation, walls, and parking further compromise visibility for vulnerable road users.

xii. Station Road (Northern Curved Section north of Ringwood Site Entrance)

- ***a. Constrained carriageway bounded by stone walls and hedgerows on both sides.***
- ***b. No continuous footpath provision; pedestrians forced to share live carriageway.***
- ***c. Insufficient effective width to accommodate general traffic and proposed cycle facilities.***
- ***d. Horizontal curvature limits forward visibility for cyclists and pedestrians.***
- ***e. Cycle provision would create pinch points and cyclist-vehicle conflict.***

f. *Non-compliant with DMURS principles for low-speed, pedestrian-priority environments.*

xiii. *Station Road (Residential Section with On-Street Parking)*

a. *Continuous on-street parking significantly reduces effective carriageway width.*
b. *Door-opening risk and side-swipe conflict for cyclists.*
c. *No formal pedestrian crossings despite residential frontage.*
d. *Cycle lane continuity not achievable without parking removal or carriageway widening.*
e. *Increased risk to vulnerable road users.*

xiv. *Station Road (Southern Approach to R617 / Village Interface)*

a. *Increase in traffic volumes approaching village core.*
b. *Junction influence zone with reduced available width.*
c. *Absence of protected cycle facilities at transition to higher-activity environment.*
d. *Pedestrian desire lines not formally accommodated.*
e. *Signalised junction visibility and operational constraints.*

xv. *R617 Village Core (Retail, Bus Stops, Signalised Junctions)*

a. *High pedestrian footfall associated with retail and bus stops.*
b. *Bus stop boarding/alighting conflicts with proposed cycle alignment.*
c. *Cycle facilities narrow or terminate at junctions creating pinch points.*
d. *Signal staging prioritises vehicular movements over pedestrian and cyclist permeability.*
e. *Shared space reliance inappropriate for village centre environment.*

xvi. *R617 Eastern & Western Approaches*

a. *Higher approach speeds entering village core.*
b. *Limited refuge or controlled pedestrian crossing provision.*
c. *Cycle facilities reduce below minimum recommended widths.*
d. *Drainage gullies and crossfall present hazards to cyclists.*

xvii. *Storm Sewer Network (Entire Corridor)*

a. *Existing public storm sewer network of limited capacity*
b. *Concentration of runoff along constrained sections.*
c. *Additional impermeable surfaces increase peak discharge.*
d. *Limited opportunity for SuDS or attenuation within road corridor.*
e. *Risk of surcharge and downstream flooding without upgrades.*

xviii. *Provide revised drawings demonstrating pedestrian crossings on all arms of the proposed signalised junction, including tactile paving, kerb upstands and compliant signal staging in accordance with DMURS.*

xix. *Demonstrate continuous and legible cycle provision through the signalised junction, including adequate crossing widths and cyclist priority in accordance with the National Cycle Manual.*

xx. Provide a detailed assessment of traffic signal head visibility on all approaches, including mitigation measures such as secondary signal heads where required.

xxi. Submit a public lighting layout for the junction, its approaches and all pedestrian and cyclist facilities, demonstrating compliance with current standards.

xxii. Provide swept path analysis for refuse vehicles, emergency vehicles and service vehicles accessing and manoeuvring within the site.

xxiii. Demonstrate how pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Station Road aligns with established desire lines, including justification for any uncontrolled crossings.

xxiv. Provide details of traffic calming measures at and in advance of the signalised junction, including consideration of raised tables or raised junction treatments.

xxv. Submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) detailing construction access, vehicle routing, wheel-wash facilities, road sweeping and gully protection.

xxvi. Provide a CCTV survey and condition assessment of the existing public storm sewer along Station Road prior to any proposed connection

xxvii. Submit hydraulic capacity and backwater analysis demonstrating that proposed storm sewer connections will not increase flood risk.

Response:

Active travel, parking and road safety matters along Station Road and its intersection with the R617 have been the subject to a series of meetings between the applicants and the Planning Authority through the Phase 1 compliance process. Please see Appendix 3 for details.

Details of required road and traffic improvements have been agreed in detail with the local authority and are re-submitted for completeness as part of this response. Please refer to Appendix 2.

4. Drainage

a. The proposed drainage strategy includes SNr. attenuation tanks. Of these, 3Nr. tanks were included in the Phase 1 development. However, the plan shape and size of tanks included in this application appear to differ from the permitted scheme. Please clarify.

b. General arrangement and layout drawings were not provided for the SNr. attenuation tanks. Where a development is intended to be taken in charge, attenuation tanks must be concrete and have sufficient access to facilitate jetting and vacuuming the tanks from the surface, without entry. Access covers must be large enough to facilitate this work and located at regular intervals to access all areas of the tanks. Internal wall arrangements should be avoided. Access covers should be suitably rated for load, lockable, flush, and have a minimum clear opening of 600mx600m square with an internal fall arrest system. Where attenuation tanks are exceptionally large or rely on internal wall arrangements, tanks must have a minimum internal clearance height of 2m from the base of the tank to the roof slab. Please provide general arrangement and cross section drawings for each tank.

c. Please provide full details of how each tank can be accessed and maintained. This shall include autotrack drawings showing how a large 10-tonne JetVac truck can access each tank, where it can be parked and positioned safely during the works. Details of any traffic management required to facilitate the work must also be detailed.

d. It should be noted that the attenuation tank located to the north of the Cafe & Retail Building is located in an area shown as not to be taken in charge. All drainage connected to and associated with this tank will also not be taken in charge. This includes any proposed storm pipes along the access road. This infrastructure will have to be managed by a private management company.

e. A number of the attenuation tanks show "Proposed SuDS locations" above the tanks. Please note that there shall be no infiltration measures above, below or adjacent to attenuation tanks. Please provide cross sections showing the tanks and proposed SuDs locations. Please clarify how storm water will flow between the SuDS locations and attenuation tanks.

f. There are also a number of SuDS areas indicated across the development. In particular, the east of the development. No details or cross sections were provided. Please provide full details and cross sections with all side slopes and maximum depth of water for each feature. Clearly highlight the full extent of the above ground storage areas.

g. The Flood Risk Assessment provided is inadequate as it does not assess the potential impact of the development on flood risk elsewhere. In particular, it does not assess the impact of discharging storm water from the development at the proposed discharge rates in the Engineering Report. The FRA states "The Phase 2 drainage design will be required to comply with". The flood risk assessment

does not consider the finalised design. Please provide a revised FRA which assessed the finalised drainage design, discharge rates and its potential impact on flood risk elsewhere.

Response:

General arrangement and layout drawings for the attenuation tanks are enclosed. Please refer to relevant drawings in Appendix 2. Details of how each attenuation tank can be appropriately accessed and maintained are shown on the updated site layout plans in Appendix 1. Autotrack drawings are enclosed in Appendix 2. All tanks are now located in areas which can be taken in charge.

The proposed development's surface water strategy has been updated and has been informed by updated Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), SuDS Statement, and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

The updated FRA has assessed the revised drainage design and discharge rates, with particular consideration given to the proposed surface water drainage strategy and its role in mitigating flood risk.

The FRA concludes:

The Further Information request from Cork City Council has been addressed by reviewing the proposed surface water drainage strategy, overland exceedance routes, finished floor levels, access and egress arrangements, and the interaction with the adjacent N20 drainage infrastructure. The Ringwood Phase 2 Stormwater Audit is now compliant, and the assessment confirms that the Proposed Development can manage post-development runoff without increasing flood risk on-site or elsewhere. As such, the Proposed Development is considered appropriate in the context of flood risk and consistent with the requirements of The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoEHLG & OPW, 2009) and the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028.

5. Temporary Construction Haul Route

A temporary construction haul route has been identified outside the red line boundary and the alignment of the Stoneview Access road, and this should follow the alignment of the Stoneview access road. Please submit revised details showing same.

Response:

The route of the temporary construction haul route for developments within Ringwood has been finalised and agreed by the Planning Authority by way of planning compliance submission in accordance with condition No.14 of the governing grant of permission for the Phase 1 development (Application Reg. Ref. 24/43031, Appeal Case Ref. ABP-321688-25).

The route is within the Ringwood and in the ownership of the applicants, and within the planning application's blue line. It is appropriate that this haul route is utilised for all phases of development within Ringwood.

6. Pump station and relationship to adjacent house

i. Please clarify the landscaping (existing and proposed) of the boundary at the southwestern corner of the site (adjacent to the Hennessy dwelling) where the pumping station is to be located.

ii. Please clarify future car park proposals and address the concerns raised about impacts on residential amenity of this property.

iii. Please clarify how the shared surface area will be used at this location and potential antisocial behaviours and lighting impacts.

Response:

Following consultations with Uisce Éireann, the pump station at this location has been omitted and a revised wastewater strategy has been agreed. The wastewater strategy is to combine the Phase 1 and Phase 2 pump stations (WPS) to the north east of site, with a second WPS constructed to facilitate the Primary Care Centre (PCC) and adjoining development area.

The land area adjacent to Hennessy dwelling, while earmarked for future residential development in Phase 3, is to remain landscaped under Phase 2. A 1.8m high block wall is to be constructed along the boundary with this neighbouring property.

This, together with proposed plant screening will mitigate the potential for impacts upon this neighbour's residential amenity. In Phase 3, it is intended to provide a small car park to serve the proposed town park at Ringwood. Its intended location best responds to the topography of the area while providing for convenient accessibility to the new park.

All these, for now draft, proposals will be subject to a future and separate planning application where their planning merits will be considered and assessed in detail.

7. Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage

The woodland area and length of hedgerows to be lost, the area of both habitats removed should be minimised as far as possible and the area of compensatory planting maximised (as new planting is not equivalent to old hedgerows or woodland).

Clarification of model of expected light spill onto the hedgerow/woodland foraging area for bats should be submitted. In addition to baseline lighting survey by suitable qualified competent person. As well as readings taken at ground level on the horizontal plane, data should be provided in at least one direction on the vertical plane. The orientation should be perpendicular to the dominant light sources or perpendicular to the surface/edge of the feature in question in order to produce a worst case reading.

Hedgerows proposed to be retained, to allow the most successful retention possible the detailed methodology during construction should be clarified which will be used to protect and retain the

hedgerows (e.g. root protection and buffer between hedgerows and development) Please refer to submission dated 28/01/2026 from Department).

Response

An updated public lighting design has been prepared to account for wetwood ecological constraints. It has been informed by a Lighting Study and the considerations of the applicants' design team ecologists. Please find a detailed response in relation to this enclosed in Appendix 2.

Hedgerow removal has been kept to a minimum as demonstrated on the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) plan in document BLR-2-02-XX-XX-RP-CSR-LA-02 and compensatory planting has been maximised as shown on the plan from Cunnane Stratton Reynolds.

Retained hedgerows will be protected during construction by the placement of securely fixed barrier fencing along the edge of the Root Protection Zones of the hedgerows prior to the commencement of development. Details of the protective measures are provided in the arborist report BLR-2-02-XX-XX-RP-CSR-TR-002 Sections 3.7 & 3.8 and on Tree Protection Plan Dwg. No. BLR-2-02-XX-00-SU-TR-106.

The assessment of this by the applicant's ecologists, enclosed in Appendix 4, concludes:

> *The approach to compensatory planting will ensure connectivity with the wider landscape (including the Ringwood and wet woodland) in conjunction with planting scheme for Phase 1 to maintain existing commuting corridors for bats and other species. In the long term, the proposed compensatory planting of native species will enhance habitat quality for commuting mammals and other fauna, while also providing indirect benefits to invertebrate populations that serve as an important food source for birds and bats.*
>
> *Localised effects associated with operational lighting may occur; however given the limited presence of photophobic species, the minimisation of vegetation removal and maximisation of compensatory planting, as well as the retention of dark refuges; landscape connectivity will be maintained and will provide suitable unlit commuting corridors for bats moving through the wider area.*

8. Uisce Éireann. Please note submission dated 03/02/2026

It is noted the applicants are in continuous engagement with Uisce Éireann and have engaged via a pre-connection enquiry and Uisce Éireann can confirm that a Confirmation of Feasibility has been issued to the applicant advising that water/wastewater connections are feasible.

Water- a connection is feasible subject to upgrades, and the applicant will be required to fund these works and will be calculated at connection application stage. In addition, a supplementary booster pump arrangement will be required to service the extent of the development.
Wastewater- a connection is feasible subject to upgrades. In order to serve the development and surrounding masterplan lands a wastewater pumping station to collect and discharge wastewater loading to existing Uisce Éireann network This WWPS should be located at a suitable location at the

southern boundary of the Development masterplan and sized to allow for modular expansion for future phases. The developer should engage further with Uisce Éireann.
Local sewer upgrades along station road may be required to cater for full proposed gravity discharge from the development/site. Hydraulic modelling will be required at connection stage.

It should be noted that while there is currently capacity in the Blanrey wastewater treatment plant to facilitate the proposed connection, capacity is limited and there are a large number of development in the Blarney area. Should enough of these developments progress before a connection application is made, this capacity may be utilised by others. In this case it will be necessary to enter an agreement with Uisce Éireann where the development will fund the necessary upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant, Uisce Éireann requires any grant of permission not have their conditions as set out in letter 03/02/2026.

Response:
Further engagement with Uisce Éireann has been undertaken and, following these meetings, a revised wastewater strategy has been agreed with them.

This strategy is the subject of a new Confirmation of Feasibility from UÉ, Ref. CDS24003261, dated 17th July 2026 (enclosed in Appendix 2), and which confirms that subject to upgrades by the developer, connections to both the water and wastewater networks are feasible.

9. EIAR

The applicant is requested to update the EIAR to take account of the above amendments and modifications to the proposed development required on foot of this request for Further Information.

Response:
Please find enclosed an EIAR Addendum Statement in Appendix 7. Amendments to the proposed development are captured within this Addendum Statement and are not considered significant in terms of their potential for impacts.

10. Appropriate Assessment Screening Report

Please submit an updated Appropriate Assessment Screening report to take account of the above amendment and modifications to the proposed development required on foot of this request for Further Information.

Response:
An Updated Appropriate Assessment Screening Report has been prepared and is enclosed in Appendix 4 of this response.

The AA Screening report concludes as follows:

> *Following the assessment detailed in this report, it is concluded that the proposed development will not, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, give rise to impacts which would constitute significant effects on the Great Island Channel SAC or Cork Harbour SPA, in view of its/their conservation objectives. Therefore, it is the recommendation of the authors of this report that Cork County Council, as the competent authority, may determine that Appropriate Assessment is not required in respect of the proposed development at Ringwood. Should any aspect of the design or construction methodology for the proposed development be materially changed, a new AA Screening Report would be required.*

Response to Third Party Submissions

Further to the above, we have reviewed the various third-party submissions made in respect of the subject application along with the submissions made by prescribed bodies.

The approach to planning and bringing the development of the site forward in 2no. Phases does not give rise to a case of project splitting. The matter was discussed with the Planning Authority in 2023 during pre-planning consultations and it was indicated that a phased approach was in accordance with the proper planning of the area, particularly in relation to the co-ordination of traffic impacts and accessibility proposals.

In any event, the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken for both phases of development was carried out on the basis of the cumulative development of the area.

For clarity, all separation distances between the rear of dwellings at Assumption Terrace are in accordance with the standards set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024. The minimum separation distance is 33m, double the minimum statutory standard.

The connections proposed to adjoining housing estates are pedestrian connections only and align accurately with the existing public footpaths in these areas. Pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure improvements on the R617 have been agreed in principle with the Planning Authority and are now included in the proposed development.

In accordance with condition No.14 of the governing grant of permission for the proposed Phase 1 development at Ringwood (Application Reg. Ref. 24/43031, Appeal Case Ref. ABP-321688-25), a Construction and Environmental Management Plan incorporating a Construction Management Plan including Traffic Management details, has been agreed with the Planning Authority through a planning compliance submission dated 8th December 2025.

A temporary haul route through the Ringwood forms part of this plan. This allows for the location of the site construction compound to the east of the development at a location removed from any residential properties or sensitive receptors and minimizes potential for traffic conflicts/congestion closer to the town along Station Road and the junction with the Shean Road. Whilst a small volume of construction traffic will continue to utilise Station Road (at strategic times), it is estimated that this will be no more than 10% of all construction traffic movements. All the above will help address residents' concerns in relation to the potential for undue construction stage impacts.

The Ringwood will be maintained and protected. A Woodland Management Plan has been prepared to ensure it continues to constitute an important feature in the landscape. As outlined in the submitted EIAR, the proposed development does not present a major risk to biodiversity, veteran trees or historic character.

We trust these points bring clarity to the nature and extent of the proposed development and provide the Planning Authority with an appropriate context within which to consider the points raised in the third-party submissions to the planning application.

It is considered that this response addresses in full the requirements of the Request for Further Information dated the 18th February 2026.

We trust everything is in order and look forward to a favourable decision in due course.

Please forward all correspondence in relation to this correspondence to this office.

Yours sincerely,



Dave Coakley
Director, Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd.

APPENDIX 1: ARCHITECTURE RESPONSE

APPENDIX 2: ENGINEERING RESPONSE

APPENDIX 3: COMPLIANCE

APPENDIX 4: ECOLOGY RESPONSE

APPENDIX 5: FLOODING RESPONSE

APPENDIX 6: LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

APPENDIX 7: EIAR ADDENDUM