

## 17.0 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED

### 17.1 Introduction

The Chapter set out a summary of the issues raised by submissions made to An Bord Pleanála from both Statutory Bodies and from the public and interest groups.

The submissions received from the Statutory Bodies are provided in Volume III EIS Appendices – Appendix 1.1.

A copy of all submissions from the public and interest groups are provided in Volume III EIS Appendices – Appendix 1.2.

| Submission from   | EIS Topic                | Issue   | How the issue is addressed with in this EIS  |
|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| Transport Infrastructure Ireland                                    | Traffic & Transportation | It has been suggested in the submissions that the current application by the Port of Cork will result in an increased Port Capacity; an increase in Port related traffic and increased congestion on the road network.  | Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.  |
| Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs | Ecology                  | The Screening for Appropriate Assessment (August 2016) is noted by the Department, in particular the statement on p.18 that works for the demolition and construction of the mooring dolphins and other marine structures will be undertaken outside the common tern breeding season (i.e. works will be restricted to September to April inclusive). There appears to be no scientific reason to disagree with the conclusion of no significant effect on Cork Harbour SPA in the Screening Report (p.24). However, this is based on the above restriction, and it is recommended that the limitation of construction and demolition of the mooring dolphins to September to April inclusive be required by condition. | Chapter 14 Marine Ecology and Chapter 15 Terrestrial Ecology & Ornithology of the EIS has established that the extant planning permission together with the conditions and environmental commitments for marine and terrestrial ecology and ornithology enshrined therein will have equal force and effect in relation to the proposed alterations and there will be no significant effect on terrestrial ecology and ornithology. |
|   | Cultural                 | The Underwater Archaeology Unit of this Department has no   | No response required.  |

|                            | Heritage                                      | issue with what is being proposed.   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Brian Flavin               | Noise & Vibration<br><br>Landscape and Visual | Submission for an objection to changes to proposed 22.5m maintenance building. It has been suggested that this will result in an increase in high levels of noise pollution.<br><br>The visual impact from the building will also devalue the homes even more than it already has.   | EIS Chapter 9 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 9.4 and 9.5. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant noise and vibration effects.<br><br>EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. A range of photomontages that provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II. |
| Patrick O'Mahony           | Landscape and Visual<br><br>Planning Policy   | This submission objects to the 22.5m high maintenance shed at location outside the development area for which planning was granted in 2015. Unacceptable proximity to existing village.  | EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. Additional photomontages have been prepared and are provided in EIS Volume II.  |
| Southern Regional Assembly | Planning Policy                               | None   | No response required.  |
| Robert J McLaughlin        | Human Beings                                  | Submission suggests that the planning permission PL04 PA0035 was granted by the board of ABP against the wishes and concerns of the harbour residents and against the boards own inspectors report. A bullying approach by the board of ABP which continues with their hastily conclusion that the present amendments fall within the scope of section 146b of the planning act 2000. ABP failed | No response required.  |

|                 |                               |  |   |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
|                 |                               | to meet the principles of their own Mission Statement and code of conduct for board members.   |   |
|                 | Noise & Vibration             | POC plan PA0035 is not sustainable. Now using 15 diesel straddle carriers. Building a massive maintenance building which can only be described as a massive noise box. | Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building will not result in significant noise impacts.  |
|                 | Lighting                      | Increase in footprint outside the allowed boundary which will increase light pollution.  | The proposed alterations will not significantly alter the lighting proposals that formed part of the permitted development. Full details of lighting alterations are provided in Chapter 3 Project Description with further assessment in Chapter 7 Landscape & Visual.       |
|                 | Traffic & Transportation      | Cost to harbour residents. Increase in traffic.  | Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. |
|                 | Air Quality                   | Air pollution caused by ships running generators, fans and other auxiliaries while tied up in harbour.   | The proposed alterations do not result in any changes to the number of ships using the permitted development. The air quality assessment for the proposed alterations is set out in Chapter 10 of the EIS and has predicted that there will be no significant impact.         |
|                 | Planning process              | Lack of time given to stakeholders to be fully informed of changes. Lack of information on POC drawings.   | The S146C EIS will be published and available for purchase or viewing for statutory period locally in accordance with planning regulations.   |
| William O'Meara | A<br>Traffic & Transportation | Concerns that the Planning Board chose to ignore the evident lack of necessary transport infrastructure serving Ringaskiddy and illogically granted permission         | Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Planning Policy</p> <p>Air Quality &amp; Climate; Landscape &amp; Visual</p> <p>Noise &amp; Vibration; Lighting</p> | <p>with conditions. The permitted and now proposed works would create additional traffic problems.</p> <p>If this PM0010 application is allowed as a "material alteration" then Port of Cork and any other applicant could use it as a precedent for almost any development within large site areas that they might own, but outside the area of a specific permission. This could reduce the entire relevant planning process to ineffectuality in many future cases. Proposals that are outside the physical area require a new, separate, planning application.</p> <p>The proposed 22.5m high building and its compound is a hazardous, unpleasant environment.</p> <p>Working at night in inclement weather multiplies the level of hazard, noise and disturbance. New lighting would pollute the night sky.</p> | <p>no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.</p> <p>The planning context for the S146C EIS Application is set out in Chapter 4 Plans and Policy of the EIS.</p> <p>The air quality assessment for the proposed alterations is set out in Chapter 10 of the EIS and has predicted that there will be no significant impact.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. A range of photomontages that provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II.</p> <p>Chapter 9 Noise &amp; Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.</p> <p>The proposed alterations will not significantly alter the lighting proposals that formed part of the permitted development. Full details of</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | lighting alterations are provided in Chapter 3 Project Description with further assessment in Chapter 7 Landscape & Visual.   |
| Vera O'Driscoll & Kaye Neill                                       | Noise & Vibration<br><br>Air quality   | Concerned as a resident about the predicted noise. No noise modelling to indicate what level of noise might be generated in the workshops of the maintenance building when the new container facility is operational.<br><br>Ringaskiddy social community forever have to suffer (24/7) health hazards from dust levels/noise/exposure and now the further 'threat' from noise emanating from proposed changes.  | Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.<br><br>The air quality assessment for the proposed alterations is set out in Chapter 10 of the EIS and has predicted that there will be no significant impact.  |
| C A M Hulehinson & List of residents names/addresses for objection | Planning Policy<br><br>Traffic & Transportation<br><br>Noise & Vibration<br><br>Landscape and Visual | New application to be submitted and not an alteration.<br><br>Concerns over traffic flow.<br><br>There is no information on the working hours of the maintenance building or on the levels of noise generated all of which could well have a negative impact on the quality of life.<br><br>We believe that the construction of a maintenance building of this size will produce an excessively large structure that is totally out of keeping with its immediate surroundings.<br>It will unnecessarily intrude | The planning context for the S146C EIS Application is set out in Chapter 4 Plans and Policy of the EIS.<br><br>Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.<br><br>Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.<br><br>EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. A |

|   |                          |  |   |
|---|--------------------------|--|---|
|   |                          | into the privacy of local resident and devalue local property values.  | range of photomontages that provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II.  |
| Kieran O'Flaherty   | Landscape and Visual     | Submission objects to the visual impact of the 22m building and the change of plan to what was already proposed and further devaluing of property.   | EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. A range of photomontages that provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II. |
|   | Noise & Vibration        | Concerns over noise impact of crane.   | Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.   |
| Cork Harbour Environmental Protection Association (CHEPA) | Planning Policy          | The Port Company in carrying out its development works with disregard to the planning conditions reflects a cavalier approach to the planning laws. The new Administration Block, Workshop facility and Canteen area, as presented, requires to be presented as a new planning application. A detailed EIS should be provided with any future application and ample opportunity given to concerned Harbour residents to respond. The precedent thus created would have disastrous consequences for proper and sustainable future planning decisions. | The planning context for the S146C EIS Application is set out in Chapter 4 Plans and Policy of the EIS.   |
|   | Traffic & Transportation | We believe that the proposal for a significant increase to dockside berth age will lead to   | Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related  |

|                                   |                                   |  |   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                   |                                   | <p>an increase in cargo handling which in turn will result in an incremental increase in vehicular traffic. This increase has not been addressed in a revised RMMP study.</p>  | <p>traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.</p>   |
|                                   | Terrestrial Ecology & Ornithology | <p>With reference to the proposed berthage extension. This proposal requires further evaluation to quantify its negative potential for the bird life and the environment. No such study has been presented.</p>  | <p>Chapters 12- 15 of the EIS presents an impact assessment of the proposed alterations on coastal processes, the water environment, marine ecology and ornithology, and set out how the proposed alterations do not result in any significant coastal processes, water environment, marine ecology or ornithology effects.</p> |
| Commission for Railway Regulation | N/A                               | None   | No response required.   |
| Cllr Seamus McGrath               | N/A                               | Opposition to the application.   | No response required.   |
| Cllr Marcia D'Alton               | Noise & Vibration                 | <p>The impact of the changes was not assessed in the original planning application. The environmental implications, particularly noise, are significantly worse. No suggestion within the original application that alterations would be required.</p> | <p>Chapter 9 Noise &amp; Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.</p>  |
|                                   | Planning Policy                   | <p>No liaison with the public to either forewarn them of these changes or to obtain their input in advance.</p>  | <p>The S146C EIS will be published and available for purchase or viewing for statutory period locally in accordance with planning regulations.</p>  |
|                                   | Landscape and Visual              | <p>Although photomontages demonstrated the impact of the proposed 22.5m high building, not one illustrated the potential impact on Ringaskiddy village.</p>  | <p>EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance building do not result in any significant visual effects. A range of photomontages that provide representative views</p>                              |

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>Traffic &amp; Transportation</p> <p>Human Beings Planning Policy</p> | <p>With this material alteration request, the total berth age available to containers would be S60m, i.e. 75% of that refused in 2008 because of the serious traffic congestion it would cause on strategic routes. But there has been no change in the road network since 2008.</p> <p>Do you think these people In Ringaskiddy have confidence in the concept of proper planning and sustainable development? The reality is that the nightmare they live through has not merely been permitted, but rather has been facilitated by the Board.</p>                      | <p>of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II.</p> <p>Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.</p> <p>The planning context for the S146C EIS Application is set out in Chapter 4 Plans and Policy of the EIS.</p> |
| Robert McLaughlin                         | J | <p>Human Beings</p> <p>Noise &amp; Vibration</p>                        | <p>Concerns over the lack of time to respond for the real stakeholders in this development.</p> <p>Intend to make a more detailed submission but need answers to the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ABP validated the noise modelling data received from POC as they are duty bound to do. If not why not.</li> <li>• POC proceeded with advanced works on the foreshore in Ringaskiddy without a foreshore licence, all under the blind eyes of the co council.</li> </ul> <p>This is a breach of planning conditions and is illegal.</p> | <p>The S146C EIS will be published and available for purchase or viewing for statutory period locally in accordance with planning regulations.</p> <p>Chapter 9 Noise &amp; Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.</p> <p>Port of Cork have been and continue to liaise with all relevant authorities in respect of the redevelopment of the port.</p>              |
| Ringaskiddy Active Retirement Association |   | Landscape and Visual  | <p>This submission details the strong objection to the change of plans by Port of Cork. Village already destroyed and not the 22m building will be a concrete eyesore.</p>  | <p>EIS Chapter 7 sets out how the proposed alterations to the maintenance building are addressed in Sections 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The proposed alterations to the maintenance</p>  |

|  |                                      |   |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
|  |                                      |   | building do not result in any significant visual effects. A range of photomontages that provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II.             |
| Monkstown District Residents Association | Water Environment; Human Environment | Lengthening of the main berth and relocation of mooring dolphins. How will this affect the high value sailing waters which are shared?  | Chapter 5 Human Environment has established that the construction and operation of the proposed alterations will not result in significant human environment impacts and in particular the social and recreational use of the harbour. |
|  | Noise & Vibration                    | Changes to the process of landside handling of containers; How will this affect the noise nuisance in the Monkstown Bay area?   | Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration has established that the construction and operation of the proposed maintenance building and the other proposed alterations will not result in significant noise impacts.                                  |
|  | Planning Policy                      | The board has decided, against the advice of its inspector in accordance with section 1468(2)(a) of the Act, that the proposed alteration would constitute a material alteration to the terms of the development. This is not a material alteration this building development requires a new planning application. The need to alter the terms of their permission is a direct result of project splitting by the Port of Cork. The new building will be about 25 feet high, it will be on land which is already reclaimed and is outside the 04.PA0035 planning permission boundary. If permitted it would create a precedent and weaken the robustness of future Strategic Infrastructure Developments. We feel the Port of Cork engaged in project splitting and the viability of port | The planning context for the S146C EIS Application is set out in Chapter 4 Plans and Policy of the EIS.  |



|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p>Traffic &amp; Transportation</p> <p>Air Quality &amp; Climate<br/>Noise &amp; Vibration<br/>Human Beings</p> | <p>building.</p> <p>How can a company dictate a new road layout at the entrance to our village because it suits them?</p> <p>We have spent many years putting up with inconvenience, dust, dirt and increased traffic for the benefit of others.</p> | <p>provide representative views of the proposed alterations from Cobh, Monkstown and Ringaskiddy have been provided in EIS Volume II.</p> <p>Chapter 8 Traffic of the EIS has established that there is no increase in port related traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations. There is therefore no increase in traffic congestion on the road network as a result of the proposed alterations.</p> <p>Chapter 9 Noise &amp; Vibration and Chapter 10 Air Quality has established that the construction and operation of the proposed alterations will not result in significant noise or air quality impacts.</p> |
|--|---|--|---|