

Submission of

Bernadette Leahy

To

An Bord Pleanála

In respect of **CASE N. NA04.310286**

<b>AN BORD PLEANÁLA</b>	
(27)	
14:44	28 SEP 2022
LTR DATED	FROM
LDG-	BERNADETTE LEAHY
ABP-	

**My name is Bernadette Leahy. I was born in Ballyhea but spent much of my working life in London before retiring home to Ballycoskery.**

**Mr. Inspector, very many thanks for the kindness afforded me in addressing An Bord Pleanála in relation to the proposed development at Ballycoskery. I would like to avail of this opportunity to clarify a number of references made to me in some of yesterday's submissions by various representatives of CIE.**

#### **Submission of Mr Richard Barker**

In number 28 (p.6), Mr Barker mentions my comments with regard to the scale of the proposed development both within the village itself and in the surrounding landscape.

In relation to the scale of the proposed development in the context of the village, Mr Barker has already mentioned that he does not consider it excessive "for its primary function to provide a safe and efficient intersection for this section of the road with this section of national railway line" (no. 24, p.5).

I wish to clarify that my original comment was in relation to the scale of the proposed development and the existing structures or features in the village of Ballyhea. I understand that the proposed development at its highest point will be at least twice the height of the present community hall. There is no structure or feature in the village of these dimensions. I maintain that Mr. Barker has not addressed my observation. Again, Mr. Barker admits that the proposed developments will "have notable physical landscape impacts within the immediate context of each site [including Ballycoskery]" (no. 68, p. 13) he offers little surety that the mitigation proposals would be effective.

#### **Submission of Mr Colin Wyllie**



In his submission, Mr Wyllie states "...there will be less through traffic moving at speed past the school and therefore improving road safety for school pupils" (n.67, p.9).

I would like to mention in this regard that the school is within an area of restricted traffic speed. The limit in front of the school is 50km.

I would also note that Mr Wyllie's comments that "there will be no loss of connectivity due to the new overbridge and it will be an improvement to pedestrians and cyclists..." is an assertion no. 67, p.9). A further repetition of this assertion at no. 127 (p.15) is entirely regrettable.

### **Submission of Mr. Gerry Healy**

I am disappointed with Mr. Healy's response to my submission indicating that it would be very difficult for me as a older driver to negotiate the proposed overbridge. While he claims that access to current facilities would maintained, he fails to address the issue of reduced ease of access created by the proposed development (n.187, p.44).

Mr. Inspector, I would kindly ask the Bord to consider whether a further general reference to DN-GEO-03031 without specifically addressing my genuine concerns is a sufficient answer especially if the referenced source makes no age active reference. I think overuse has been made of this reference throughout the responses made to submissions made by the public.

At no 96 in reply my observation regarding the exhibition of outdated maps during the 'consultation' of the proposed development, Mr. Healy states that the drawings are based on the "latest versions provided by the Ordinance Survey which may not have recent buildings included..". I would ask the Bord to note that Mr. Healy does not mention a date on which the Ordinance Survey provided their 'latest versions'. It might also note that the most up to date versions supplied to the M20 project do reflect changes that have occurred since 2011.

Mr. Inspector, thank you very much for your kind attention.