

Appendix 1A: Cork County Council (CCC) Consultation

Table A.1 Cork County Council (CCC) Consultations

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
Issues Raised	Response/Where this is addressed
Initial contact email from Jacobs, 7th August 2019, to John Slattery (Senior Engineer) in CCC Regional and Local RDO.	N/A
File Uploaded to CCC Cloud File Share site, to John Slattery (Senior Engineer, CCC Reg & Local RDO) & Brian Deasy (Executive Engineer, CCC Reg & Local RDO), 7th August 2019. File Share Jacobs to John Slattery 7 th August 2019 Issued Feasibility Report for reference.	N/A
Cork County Council Meeting, 21st August 2019	
Meeting with Ted O'Sullivan (Executive Engineer, Reg & Local RDO) in Cork Co. Co. Mallow office, 21st August 2019. Reviewed draft preliminary road design drawings. Agreed that proposals are an improvement on existing arrangements. No specific issues with any sites at present. Design details to be issued to CCC for review.	N/A
Aidan Weir (Roads and Transportation) 29th August 2019 Query regarding the initial solutions for each crossing.	Email from Jacobs dated 30th August 2019 setting out emerging preferred options for each site.
Issued Preliminary Design Report to Cork County Council, 25th September 2019	
File Transfer to Ted O'Sullivan (Executive Engineer, Reg & Local RDO), 25th September 2019 (forwarded to relevant persons within Cork County Council). Issued Draft Preliminary Design Report.	N/A
Consultation with Heritage Unit	
Mary Sleeman (Heritage Unit), 30th September 2019 Sets out that of the five sites in Cork three are modern level crossings and there is no issue with replacement but recommends photographic record. Requires clarity on proposed solution for XC212 Ballycoskery and XC211 Newtown. States that XC211 Newtown is a fine stone arched bridge and clarification sought regarding proposed works.	Email from Jacobs dated 2nd October 2019 to Assumpta Drake and Paul Murphy providing more detailed mapping.
Mary Sleeman (Heritage Unit), 2nd October 2019 States that if the level crossings XC211 and XC212 Newtown and Ballycoskery are like the other level crossings (modern) "there is no heritage issue with replacement".	Volume 3, Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage assesses the likely impact and significance of effect on Cultural Heritage as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Project.
Responses to Preliminary Design Report (PDR), 11th October 2019	
Aidan Weir (Senior Engineer, Roads and Transportation), 11th October 2019 (cc'd Paul Murphy, John Slattery, Michael Cotter, Ted O'Sullivan, Jim Moloney, Brendan O'Gorman). Noted that the proposals will improve road safety and provide accessibility for motorists on a permanent basis on those gates	Email issued from Jacobs to Aidan Weir 4th November 2019.

Appendix 1A: Cork County Council Consultation

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
which were closed at night, but also had a number of queries re Rail Order process and road designs.	
Queries regarding the Railway Order process and construction timeframes.	<p>Non – Statutory Public Consultation - Q4 2019.</p> <p>Lodge Railway Order Application - Q1/Q2 2021,</p> <p>Construction Commencement -Q3/ Q4 2021</p> <p>Construction Completion Q2/Q3 2023.</p> <p>Consent mechanism for works will be Railway Order, Part VIII not required.</p> <p>RO will give IE CPO rights.</p> <p>All locations will be under single RO application.</p> <p>Submission will be welcomed from public and CCC prior to application and as part of the RO process.</p>
Noted preference to agree all designs with IÉ prior to Rail Order application.	Agreed.
Comment regarding river bridge at XC209 Ballyhay.	No longer relevant as works at XC209 Ballyhay now include a 4 barrier CCTV level crossing.
Requesting CAD versions of all road designs.	CAD to be issued.
XC219 Buttevant extension of speed limit is not in keeping with Department of Environment Guidelines. Also requires lengthy process by CCC and not a given. Next cycle of speed limit revisions to be carried out in 2022.	Scheme design and design speed carried forward from Feasibility Design. Alignment to be reviewed for design speed of 85kph. It is noted that this may result in further departures in order to reduce impact on surrounding environment.
XC212 Ballycoskery 8% gradient concerning for school children crossing. Road type should be Type 3 not Other Road. Set down area at school is welcome. Can school bus turn in school set down area?	<p>Footways are all set at 5% to allow for pedestrian movements.</p> <p>Road type staying as Other road as this is a local rural road with existing carriageway cross sections of 5m to west and 4.5m to east, with no hard strips.</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Confirmed by vehicle tracking software.</p>
Comment related to works at XC209 Ballyhay	No longer relevant as works at XC209 Ballyhay now 4 barrier CCTV level crossing.
Requested list of design relaxations and justifications be set out and issued to CCC. Justification of design speeds required.	<p>Full list of relaxations and justifications to follow.</p> <p>Initial draft design speeds noted in the Preliminary Design Report were calculated using anticipated speeds (using existing traffic survey data), or existing/proposed speed limits. As these proposed alignments are all relatively short road diversions, it was envisaged that this method might be the most appropriate to help reduce speeds and reduce the impact on the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Design speeds to be reviewed for XC212 Ballycoskery (update to 60kph if possible), XC215 Shinanagh (update to 85kph), XC219 Buttevant (update to 85kph if possible).</p>
CCC to approve all final road designs and associated relaxations.	Design and relaxations being finalised for issued to CCC.
<p>Greg Simpson (Senior Planner), 2nd December 2019</p> <p>This set out that "Feedback received from the Council Ecologist is that; Following a high-level review of the above project the only comments I have are set out below:</p>	<p>Volume 3, Chapter 7: Biodiversity includes consideration of the Blackwater SAC and a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared at Volume 5, Appendix 7H.</p> <p>Mammal surveys were undertaken in July and October 2019.</p>

Appendix 1A: Cork County Council Consultation

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
<p><i>Crossings located at Ballyhea, Newtown, Ballycoskery, Shinanagh and Buttevant are all located within the catchment of the Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) Special Area of Conservation (Site Code:2170). It is recommended that a mammal survey for otter should be carried out in respect of each of these sites and consultation should take place with NPWS and IFI in relation to each of these sites as there is potential for direct and indirect impacts on the SAC and fisheries."</i></p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken with both the NPWS and IFI.</p>
Cork County Council Meeting 22 nd January 2020	
Issues Raised	Response/Where this is addressed
<p>Meeting with Michael Cotter (Senior Executive Engineer), Ted O'Sullivan (Executive Engineer), Thomas Watt & Greg Simpson (Planning Dept), in Cork County Council Offices, 22nd January 2020.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>CCC considered the principle of the proposed Project to be sound and commented that if the Dublin-Cork Rail line is to be electrified and if the County seeks to encourage more sustainable forms of transport this type of project is necessary. The health and safety concerns associated with level crossings and the need to replace/upgrade was also acknowledged.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>CCC XC211 Newtown comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CCC highlighted the potential for underground services nearby to the housing estate; and ▪ sought clarity on upgrade works. 	<p>Upgrade of existing road is outside scope of proposed Project. Alignment will tie in with existing road.</p>
<p>CCC XC212 Ballycoskery comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CCC queried use of offline footway – would pedestrians cut across switch-back; ▪ street lighting would be required along offline footway ▪ Requested photomontages once available; and ▪ Requested construction dates. 	<p>Upgrade of existing road is outside scope of proposed Project. Alignment will tie in with existing road.</p>
<p>XC212 Ballycoskery:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Queried use of offline footway – would pedestrians cut across switch-back; 2) Secondary online footpath should be looked at along 8% section of road to avoid people walking on verge; 3) Street lighting would be required along offline footway. Final design by qualified street lighting designer; 4) Queried use of 'Other' carriageway type rather than Type 3. Noted that verge widths are less important, but carriageway width may be required; and 5) Noted that if 60kph design speed not feasible, review of 50kph design speed with mitigations maybe acceptable. 	<p>Jacobs Comments 08/07/2020</p> <p>Offline footway created to allow 5% gradient for pedestrians. Slope of ground across switch back section would likely be too steep to encourage people to cut through.</p> <p>Extension of online footpath now added along the western approach to the structure, however the offline ramped alternative of max 5% gradient is still available to pedestrians if desired.</p> <p>Street lighting will be denoted on offline section of footpath, qualified street lighting designers will specify final design at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Type 3 Single carriageway has been adopted with 3m lane widths, 0.5m hard strips and 3m verge (including hard strip). Road cross section tapers back to existing widths at tie in points.</p> <p>Increase in design speed to 60kph is not feasible with the site constraints. The change in carriageway type to a Type</p>

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses

3 Single also means that the western approach gradient was required to be reduced from 8% to 7% to avoid an additional departure, adding additional constraints.

As per TII Rural Road Link Design, the Design Speed should be consistent with the anticipated vehicle speeds on the road and is not directly related to the mandatory speed limits. Traffic survey results at this location show an 85th percentile vehicle speed of 53.3kph.

Carriageway and online footway are also separated by both a verge and safety barrier, improving pedestrian safety and limiting interactions between vehicles and pedestrians along the main stretch of the carriageway.

Cork Co. Co. Response 16/07/2020

Comments/queries; Is there any Safety barrier between road and online footpath (or behind the footpath at top of slope) on western approach? – there seems to be a barrier/raised retaining wall on the eastern departure.

Does the offline footway/ramp incorporate intermediate landings (i.e. regular short horizontal 'rest' sections)? Presumably it also will incorporate handrailing and lighting?? M.C.'s comments; the Irish Wheelchair Association's access guidelines recommends that intermediate landings be provided after each 10m slope (@ 1:20). Perhaps the original layout with the greater number of zig-zags achieved this better than the current revised layout?

There is no detail referring to a crash barrier along the southern verge where it is on high embankment leading up to the barrier bridge parapet railing. Surely this is necessary. A few Cross-sections would be desirable to illustrate how all of the elements coalesce. I would suggest on both approaches to the bridge and across the bridge itself, inclusive of the school side retaining wall/parking area on the eastern approach and the pedestrian ramp area on the western approach.

Noted and accepted RE street lighting, 'Other' carriageway type and design speed.

Will this barrier extend through the bridge section onto the eastern side?

Having looked at it closely on site, I generally wonder has the design been optimised on the eastern side in relation to the sag curve between Ch 30 – 90. The attached photos outline the fact that there is a sharp incline towards the Priest's house entrance and an incline into the housing estate entrance, which if capitalised upon may allow the proposed road levels to increase with chainage, (albeit in a sag curve) rather than the current vertical alignment, which has the proposed road levels dropping to a low point in advance of the 7% gradient. I would appreciate if this was given some consideration but will accept if it is simply not a feasible option.

Jacobs Comments 20/10/2020

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
	<p>There is currently a barrier at the top of the retaining wall to the east of the bridge structure but neither section of online footpath adjacent to the grassed embankment have barriers proposed.</p> <p>The online footway to the east of the bridge structure was designed to the recommended longitudinal gradient of max 5% (DN-PAV-03026 Footway Design Table 2.3). To the west of the bridge structure, the footway was taken offline to enable the continuation of this 5% gradient. It was not designed as a pedestrian/wheelchair ramp with landings. Although in saying that, the changes in direction would necessitate a type of landing area. Similar to the sections of online footway adjacent to grassed embankments, there would be no handrail proposed along this offline footpath.</p> <p>Similar to comment below in relation to the extent of safety barrier, the attached General Arrangement drawing shows the extent of the safety barriers along all section of high embankment. Barriers are shown as purple or orange lines, as noted in the GA drawing legend. We are currently in the process of producing contiguous elevations through the road works in relation to adjacent properties, I have added an excerpt from one such in progress drawing as Figure A below, showing the safety barrier locations on the road cross section.</p> <p>As shown on the General Arrangement drawing (attached for reference), the purple line denotes the H4a barrier running along the carriageway edge, through the bridge structure, and on approach to the structure on either side. The orange line then denotes the N2 barrier that then continues to the east and west of the structure from approx. Ch80 to Ch320</p> <p>I have attached a profile drawing of the mainline, including the alignment profiles of the side road at Ch70 ('Northwest connector') and the link to the priest's house ('Northwest connector – Left Access') showing the mainline SAG curve and the tie in to the Priests house have been maximised where possible.</p>
<p>XC215 Shinanagh:</p> <p>1) Queried use of 'Other' carriageway type rather than Type 3. Noted that verge widths are less important, but carriageway width may be required;</p> <p>2) 5.5m carriageway width may be acceptable at tie-in to existing, but Jacobs to review widening of carriageway at bend, with hatched road marking used; and</p> <p>3) Queried if there was enough width on existing N20 to add new right turn lane. Noted that probably enough room in the hard shoulder as this was the case when adding the existing right turn lane at the level crossing. Noted that length of RTL should be checked.</p>	<p>Jacobs Comments 21/05/2020</p> <p>Carriageway upgraded to Type 3, however, as per meeting note 16 below, we have applied a departure in the cross section of 5.5m carriageway width to tie in with existing road widths. Carriageway has been widened at bend and road marking added.</p> <p>Topographic survey required to confirm existing N20 pavement width. Right turn lane dimensions have been checked and will be fully designed at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>5.5m would be acceptable as a compromise provided that Item 4. Below is conceded.</p>

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
	<p>Agreed. Note that Area Engineer has pointed out the Irish rail need to ensure that the revised access to Imphrick Old Graveyard is agreed with the landowner as it transfers the field crossing point to a new location.</p> <p>Noted in relation to issue 3.</p>
<p>XC219 Buttevant:</p> <p>1) Queried use of 'Other' carriageway type rather than Type 3. Noted that verge widths are less important, but carriageway width may be required; and</p> <p>2) Noted departures on horizontal alignment could be agreeable is sufficient visibility was given. Vertical departures could be mitigated with warning signs and possible addition of street lighting to bridge. Noted street lighting at top of bridge would not impact adjacent dwellings.</p>	<p>Jacobs Comments 21/05/2020</p> <p>Carriageway upgraded to Type 3, with 6m carriageway, 0.5m hard strip, and relaxations on the remaining 2.5m verge in locations.</p> <p>Horizontal Geometry:</p> <p>Two 180m radius curves (4 steps below DM for 85km/h) are required at the eastern end of the scheme due to site constraints tying into existing road and minimizing impact on existing properties at the tie in and in the Irish Rail yard at the bridge structure. Tight constraints also limited the road length available for transitions curves at this location. One 360m radius curve (1 step below DM) was required at the western tie in.</p> <p>Vertical Geometry:</p> <p>One K=17 crest curve over the bridge structure (2 steps below DM) was required at the bridge structure due to the constrained length of road available to tie back down to existing levels. Two K=13 Sag curves (2 steps below DM) were required to tie back into existing levels at either end of scheme. Max vertical gradient of 7% on western approach to bridge.</p> <p>SSD:</p> <p>The existing property boundary wall at approx. Ch 0+500, and the 180m Radius curve, reduces the E-W SSD to 90m at this location, 2 steps below DM. The same property boundary wall also reduces the W-E direction SSD to 120m at this location.</p> <p>The northern pedestrian guardrails over the structure parapet and retaining wall reduce the horizontal SSD in a W-E direction to 90m over the length of the guardrail.</p> <p>There is full visibility to the top of the crest curve from both directions, however the reduced crest curve leads to a reduced SSD over the crest curve of 90m (2 steps below DM) for low object visibility.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <p>Footpath and lighting have been extended to the top of bridge This will allow pedestrians to cross at a safer location, at the top of the crest curve, with full visibility from both directions. W140 warning sign (Pedestrians) is located either side of the bridge to warn oncoming vehicles.</p> <p>A W009L warning sign (Side Road on Outside of Left Bend) will be located east of the scheme tie in to warn oncoming vehicles of the sharp bend and the minor access road to the right.</p>

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
	<p>A W053L warning sign (Series of Sharp Bends – Left) will be located west of the bridge to warn oncoming vehicles of the road geometry beyond the bridge crest curve.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>Cork County Council are satisfied with this response.</p> <p>Cork County Council acknowledge that the design is a best fit to the local constraints, whilst still maintaining a reasonable standard, with mitigating measures such as road markings, signage and crash barriers to overcome necessary relaxations/departures. Difficult to judge elements of the plan and elevation as they will only print off in A4 size. Typical Cross sections would be helpful on either approach to the bridge and on the bridge itself. Some concern about the safety of pedestrians who may cross at the uncontrolled crossing on Buttevant side of the rail line and Council would require a Stage 1/2 Road safety Audit of this particular scheme given the scale of the project and the interaction between different modes. The results of such audit need to be made available to Cork County Council along with any mitigating proposals deemed necessary.</p>
<p>General:</p> <p>Noted departures due to site constraints may be accepted where it can be seen that every effort has been made to achieve highest standard, and sufficient mitigation measures are put in place where departures are granted.</p>	<p>Jacobs Comments 21/05/2020</p> <p>Carriageway has been upgraded to Type 3 Single. 6m carriageway, 0.5m hard strip, relaxations in the remaining 2.5m width of verge at locations.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>Acceptable</p>
<p>Noted that overall, they agree that scheme will be an improvement on current arrangement in terms of safety, and that there are no showstoppers in terms of design details.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>CCC confirmed no further comments are likely to issue in addition to those already raised.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Follow up Email from Cork County Council, 23rd January 2020	
Issues Raised	Response/Where this is addressed
<p>Email from Michael Cotter (cc'd Ted O'Sullivan, Jim Moloney, Aidan Weir) regarding XC215 Shinanagh and XC219 Buttevant, 23rd January 2020.</p>	<p>N/A.</p>
<p>XC215 Shinanagh:</p> <p>1) Retain the proposed tie-in from N20 to existing bridge to T-junction with new road;</p> <p>2) Traffic approaching on N20 from north to be directed to turn right at N20 junction north of existing bridge. This would remove need for new right turn lane;</p> <p>3) Traffic from Churchtown wanting to go south on N20 to be directed right over existing bridge and right at N20 junction. Or</p>	<p>Jacobs Comments 21/05/2020</p> <p>Would this solution still be agreeable to Cork Co. Co. if we did not include the 350m of road resurfacing in the scheme (as per response to comment 4 below).</p> <p>Issue 3 Agreed.</p> <p>Alignment ties in 135m from existing bridge and 350m from existing N20 junction to north. The upgrade of existing road is outside the scope of this project. We also have no survey information on the conditions of the existing road so it would not be possible to quantify the</p>

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
<p>they could travel past existing bridge to N20 junction north of existing bridge; and</p> <p>4) Alignment appears to end half way between existing bridge junction and existing N20 junction north of existing bridge. Existing road at this point is 4.5m but has adequate width and hardstanding to increase this to uniform width of rest of proposed alignment. Recommend resurfacing and uniform width extended northwards as far as junction with N20, given that this would be used by Churchtown bound motorists approaching from N20 north.</p> <p>5) Retain the proposed tie-in from N20 to existing bridge to T-junction with new road</p>	<p>extent of works required to upgrade this existing section of road.</p> <p>Agreed issue 5.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>Noted. The project obviously needs to make provision for the installation or moving of Advanced direction signs on the N20 or elsewhere and will need to consult with TII on the changes proposed to the national route signage.</p> <p>It would be acceptable and preferable provided that if it allowed for the resurfacing of the 350m length to the 5.5m pavement width proposed along the remainder of the diverted route. The existing right turn lane north of Shinanagh Bridge is deemed a safer option than the one proposed south of the bridge and there are also concerns about the safety of diverting all the traffic across the old skew bridge with its blind 90-degree bends. Irish Rail need to consult with TII in any case for either option as there will be a changed number of right turn movements in either case.</p> <p>Cork County Council considered that it would not be safe bringing traffic along an improved road and merging back into an unimproved road with a narrower surface area (currently 4.5m) in advance of that road's intersection with the N20 road, a mere 350m further along. No matter what the configuration it is highly unlikely that traffic heading north on the new road (from Churchtown side) will divert right at the skew bridge, going back on themselves, so it is imperative that this form part of the scheme. This element of the road was originally the N20 and hence the potential is there to widen it as it would surely have been at least 7m wide previously.</p> <p>Noted issue 5.</p>
<p>XC219 Buttevant:</p> <p>1) Area Engineer in agreement with Michael Cotter that road should be Type 3 Single with carriageway 6m and verge 3m (inclusive of hard strip);</p> <p>2) Concern regarding safety of pedestrians/cyclists crossing the bridge as crash barriers shown close to road edge giving minimal room for ped/cyclists to step in;</p> <p>3) Recommend extending footpath to bridge on one side and widening verge on far side to allow step in; and</p> <p>4) Recommend lighting to also extend to the bridge.</p>	<p>Jacobs Comments 21/05/2020</p> <p>Carriageway has been upgraded to Type 3 Single. 6m carriageway, 0.5m hard strip, relaxations in the remaining 2.5m width of verge at locations.</p> <p>The crash barrier has been moved back to 1m from the pavement edge. This, along with the 0.5m hard strip allows sufficient room for pedestrians/cyclists to step in off the road if required.</p> <p>Proposed lighting has been extended to the bridge in line with extended footpath.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>Acceptable in relation to all issues.</p>
Cork County Council Comments Following Further Consultation on XC211 Newtown, 10th February to Friday 6th March 2020	
Issues Raised	Response/Where this is addressed

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
Email from Jacobs to Cork County Council (Thomas Watt, Michael Cotter, Ted O'Sullivan, Greg Simpson) directing them to the Irish Rail Project Site to updated PRD, EIAR Screening and Scoping, and XC211 Newtown Blue Route drawings, for their review and comment.	N/A
Follow up email from Jacobs to CCC, 22nd April 2020, requesting any comments on updated PDR and XC211 Newtown Blue Route.	N/A
<p>Email from Michael Cotter (cc'd Ted O'Sullivan, Jim Moloney) regarding XC211 Blue Route, 23rd April 2020.</p> <p>Noted that design is below standard but does achieve a reasonable standard for a very minor rural road and has to be looked at in this context and acknowledge that the route is a very minor road with very low traffic volumes and has to fit to certain constraints. Issues of concern outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Query standard for constructing new road at less than 5m width. 1m grassed verge would need to be of relative hard standing if it is to be utilised on occasion. If using 4m carriageway width, there is concern about the lack of passing bay at the straight section to the north. One or other vehicle may be required to reverse out onto the main road to pass at this location. An extra passing bay would be desirable at this stretch, or perhaps if even the first 10-20m at the northern end were 5m wide a vehicle could reverse to there. Current location for passing bay should be sufficient to cover the element from the bend to the southern tie-in as vehicles can see far enough; 2) Concern regarding 4% down gradient running to norther junction tie-in. It is normal to introduce a sag curve in such circumstances so that at least the last 10m, dwell area, would be of the order of 1%; 3) Noted that sightlines of at least 90m should be achieved in either direction for a vehicle emerging from the sideroad. Ideally at 4.5m offset, but at a minimum of 3m offset from edge of main road. Sightlines are not indicated in reports; 4) Cross section shows drop off at outside of 1m wide verge, on embankment. It would be usual to allow for slightly more landtake and to erect a 1.2m high mound at the outside of the verge, if only to give guidance to vehicle at night, as to where the limits are. If this isn't possible, at least provide for a timber post and rail fence as a visual aid; and 5) Traffic counts indicate that pedestrians do use the road. Need to ensure that there is adequate way for them to step in from a vehicle. 	<p>Jacobs Comments 04/06/2020</p> <p>Road cross section is chosen to tie in with existing road width to the south. Passing bay locations have been revised. A second passing bay has now been added further south on the alignment, in line with TII standards (DN-GEO-03030) for minimum distances between passing bays. The two passing bays provided over the full length of the scheme would allow for passing traffic so that the grassed verge is not required to be hard standing material. A relaxation of the dwell area gradient to a max of 4% (in accordance with TII standard DN-GEO-03060) is deemed necessary at this location in order to gain elevation at the crest curve to the south of the junction reducing the earthworks cut adjacent to the existing property boundary line.</p> <p>Sightlines of 90m at 3m offset are achieved to the east and west. It is proposed to cut back existing vegetation between the junction and the existing bridge to the west (within Irish Rail land), to aid these sightlines.</p> <p>Safety barriers located on embankments would give guidance to vehicles as to the limits of the carriageway. The inclusion of the safety barrier also results in a wider overall verge with of minimum 2.2m (1m set back from carriageway and 1.2m working width behind).</p> <p>Safety barriers have been set back a minimum of 1m from edge of carriageway to allow pedestrian room to step in off the carriageway as required.</p> <p>Cork Co. Co. Response</p> <p>Cork County Council are satisfied with the revised plan layout. Would appreciate some cross-sections to illustrate layout.</p> <p>Confirmed that DNGEO-03038 does allow a relaxation to 4% in difficult situations and hence Cork County Council acknowledge the requirement here due to the possible infringement of the adjacent property line, otherwise.</p> <p>This is acceptable to Cork county Council subject to the 90m @ 3m being achieved on the ground following construction.</p> <p>This is acceptable in relation to issue 4 to Cork County Council but again some cross sections would be desirable to confirm the plan layout.</p>

Appendix 1A: Cork County Council Consultation

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses	
	This is acceptable to Cork County Council in relation to issue 4.
Cork County Council Comments 3rd December 2020	
Issues Raised	Response/Where this was addressed
<p>Meeting held with Aidan Weir, Michael Cotter, Jim Moloney, Thomas Watt, Greg Simpson of Cork County Council, James Kenny and Diarmuid Dunne of Iarnród Éireann (IÉ) and Tony Magee, Alex Bradley and Fiona McDonnell of Jacobs on 3rd December 2020.</p> <p>Overview of scheme status was presented (PowerPoint attached) by Jacobs, explaining the current status and the development of the project.</p>	N/A
<p>Cork CoCo noted the upgrade of XC209 Ballyhay was to CCTV (and not elimination or replacement with a bridge), and whether the crossing will be accessible over a 24-hour period. IÉ explained that a replacement by a bridge was discounted at feasibility/options stage, and the proposal to upgrade to a CCTV crossing is an improvement (safer, more reliable, improved access) on the current situation as there is currently no 24 hour provision at the level crossing. Cork CoCo Planning acknowledged that this proposal is an upgrade to the existing situation at the level crossing.</p>	N/A
<p>The public consultation process was queried and whether there would be further opportunity for consultation on the scheme. Jacobs explained that there had been two rounds of non-statutory public consultation, and that there would be opportunity for stakeholders and members of the public to attend the Oral Hearing following the lodging of the Railway Order application.</p>	N/A
<p>There were discussions around Road Safety Audits (RSA), and Jacobs explained that Stage 1 RSAs had been undertaken of the Preliminary Design. Cork CoCo stated that the RSAs must cover the junction arrangement on the N20 at Shinanagh and that these must be approved on the TII online system.</p>	Noted.
<p>Cork CoCo confirmed that Jacobs should also liaise directly with Kieran McKeone from the Cork National Road Office.</p>	Noted.
<p>At XC215 Ballycoskery, the entrance to the single dwelling property to the west of the estate was discussed. Jacobs agreed to summarise the design development process in relation to constraints and design standards regarding the entrance to this property.</p>	The summary of the design development process in relation to constraints and design standards regarding the entrance to this property will be identified.
<p>Regarding landscaping of the scheme, Cork CoCo reiterated the desire to have minimal maintenance requirements imposed as part of the scheme (e.g. shrubs preferred to requirement of grass cutting). Cork CoCo (Planning) referred to the opportunity to explore the national Pollinator Plan on this scheme.</p>	It is proposed to include a wild grass seed mix that is low/no maintenance and is a typical grass type found along the embankments of a road scheme. It should not require weekly grass cuts in the summer months. At most the grass may require to be cut once a year, if at all.
<p>Jacobs noted that the next stage is to finalise pre-application consultation, complete the Railway Order documentation, and</p>	Noted.

Cork County Council Consultee (CCC) Responses

<p>lodge the Railway Order application. IÉ noted that the consultation with Cork CoCo has been very helpful in closing out any issues and trusted that Cork CoCo are supporters of the scheme during the approvals process. Cork CoCo representatives confirmed that they were generally happy with the scheme with no further issues raised. However, it was noted that the Elected Members may make observations on the scheme when the scheme is lodged for RO.</p>	
--	--