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Gwen Malone Stenography Services certify the following to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic notes in the above-named action. AS FOLLOWS:

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, I'll start with I think there's a few votes of sympathy. Gail Dunne, Cl1r. Dunne. CLLR. DUNNE: No, Chairman. MS. GALLAGHER: Cathaoirleach, for Tom Kinsella, father of our colleague, shane Kinsella, brother of our colleague, Andrew Kinsella. For Lynn McGlynn, sister of our colleague, Richard Murphy, and for our friend and colleague, Martin Lowe.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Fortune.
CLLR. FORTUNE: I would also like to pass a vote of sympathy on the death of Lily Roe, from Avondale Park in Bray. She was 107. She died yesterday. She was probably the oldest person in wicklow.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Vance.
CLLR. FORTUNE: Sorry, Chairman, years ago you made a presentation to her when she turned 100.
CLLR. VANCE: I'd like to propose a vote of sympathy for the family of Charlie Gray, a well known man in Bray who died.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Members.
[ONE MINUTE'S SILENCE WAS OBSERVED]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhil1.

CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. Cathaoirleach, I'd just like to be -- I will be asking for a Suspension of Standing Orders and I believe that I gave you notification that $I$ would be doing same.

I would just like to mention first that I do believe that correspondence has been received by management in relation to a letter from the Minister, Simon Harris, in relation to legal advice re St. Paul's and I would like if this matter would be confirmed and the letter could be circulated to all the Members. And also, leading into that I would just like to relay -CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, Brendan, just two points. Could you just get to the point of why you want a Suspension of Standing Orders. And, also, I didn't actually receive an e-mail from you, I texted you back to say I didn't receive an e-mail and up to about 12:00 o'clock I hadn't received an e-mail. Would you just tell us why you want a Suspension of Standing Orders? CLLR. THORNHILL: It's in relation to an e-mail and sure we all received an e-mail in relation to a conflict of interest by one of the Councillors in this Council Chamber.

This letter was written to Mr. Sweetman. He, as the Law Agent, was written to and it's about one of the Councillors who had played a prominent role in promoting the destruction of st. Paul's Lodge and it was spoken and voted on the matter a number of times.

He's the Director of a company that has a contract for a HR consultancy workshop and other advisory services for staff at wicklow County Council.

I found this interest has been declared on the 2017 declaration form but these forms had not been as yet published. It's in relation to this I would like to have the matter clarified in relation to the conflict of interest. That's the reason $I$ would be calling for a Suspension of Standing Orders.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is anyone else supporting that Suspension? I'm not getting support for that Suspension of Standing Orders so I'm not going to accept it. okay. Cllr. whitmore.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Thanks, Chair. At the last meeting there was a motion put forward that was to be on the agenda for today but it's not on there in relation to seeking legal advice on what can be discussed when Part 8 s come to the Chamber. I think either yourself or Lorraine said --
MR. CURRAN: We discussed Part 8s at the CPT this morning and in particular the issue about dividing them out in Municipal Districts so it will be on the agenda for the next meeting. We have a position paper setting out the legislation and how it works, what it's about, the agenda for the next meeting.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Cullen.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, we agreed some time back
here at the Baltinglass Municipal Authority about the graveyard policies for graveyards in the Baltinglass municipal District and it was supposed to come back before the full council. Is it possible, Chairman, that you could arrange to have it on the agenda for the 14:12 next Council meeting?
CATHAOIRLEACH: I have no issue to that. I think it was put to the Districts and they were all to come with recommendations back to the full council meeting. It wasn't just the Baltinglass District, it was the five districts. I don't believe it has been on the agenda since the local meetings. I don't have any issue with that coming back on the agenda.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Put it on the next Council meeting.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Is that agreed by the Members?
FROM THE FLOOR: Yeah.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhill, you wanted to come back there?

CLLR. THORNHILL: Yeah. Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. Cathaoirleach, I sent you an e-mail and for whatever reason maybe it didn't get to you, but I also sent you a text today as well reminding you that I was going to call for a Suspension of Standing orders.
CATHAOIRLEACH: That's correct and I responded to your text and I just said I didn't receive your e-mail so I didn't know what you were talking about.
CLLR. THORNHILL: I mentioned on the text that I was
going to call for a Suspension of Standing Orders. CATHAOIRLEACH: That's true, yeah.
CLLR. THORNHILL: And I have just outlined exactly hwy I'm calling for a Suspension of Standing Orders.
CATHAOIRLEACH: You've done that, yeah. Okay, thanks. 14:13 Okay, Members --
CLLR. THORNHILL: So I take it -- is it going to be taken?
CATHAOIRLEACH: No, I already dealt with it.
CLLR. THORNHILL: okay, right. Okay.
CLLR. FORTUNE: Sorry, I missed the conversation, I apologise. My concern is, I think C11r. Thornhill is being treated with a little bit of disrespect. CATHAOIRLEACH: In what way?
CLLR. FORTUNE: In that, I'm just reflecting what I'm picking up from the tone of the way he's being dealt with. He's asked to -- I heard him asking about some letter that the Minister is supposed to have sent in and that he wanted to talk about that. I think that's something we should talk about if that is the case.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I asked him what did he want a Suspension of Standing orders for, what the purpose of it was and he told me.

CLLR. FORTUNE: He said what?
CATHAOIRLEACH: I asked him what was the Suspension of Standing Orders for and he expressed that and he didn't say the letter was the reason for the Suspension of Standing orders he said it was something else. CLLR. FOX: He had no seconder, Chairman.

CATHAOIRLEACH: And I asked was there any support for it. I thought it was fair.
CLLR. MCLOUGHLIN: It was fair.
CLLR. SHAY CULLEN: I think you dealt with it.
CLLR. FORTUNE: I'11 just put it on the record, from my own perspective I personally have had an issue with the way he's been dealt with. I want to put it on as a matter of record. Obviously the inner sanctum, as I've referred to it many years ago, is alive and well here so he's going to be beaten down no matter what he tries to say. I think the Suspension of Standing Orders, if he wants to talk about correspondence I think that's fine and if he needs a seconder I'll second it for him. CATHAOIRLEACH: That's not what he asked for. He asked for something else.
CLLR. VANCE: Chairman, we discussed this and there was no seconder.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, I'm moving on.
CLLR. FORTUNE: I think that's not the way we should be doing our business here, Chairman, and I think to be
fair, and I have great respect for you, I really have, but I think in handling the matter the way it has been handled I think leaves a bit to be desired. I think it's being a little bit cute and it's being disrespectful to C11r. Thornhill in my view. Okay, he wrote to you and you didn't get the mail but he sent you a text as we11. So, come on, I mean, there's stuff suspend here in this Chamber for all kinds of things and there's no problem with it at all.

CATHAOIRLEACH: whether he texted me or whether I got the e-mail or not wasn't relevant to the decision we made five minutes ago. I was just pointing out that. He said he sent me an e-mail and I just said I didn't receive the e-mail.

CLLR. FORTUNE: Well --
CATHAOIRLEACH: Let me finish. And he got sent me a text to say see the e-mail and I just texted Brendan to say Brendan, I didn't actually receive the e-mail. And then I went looking at the e-mail up to about

12:00 o'clock and I hadn't seen it. He sent me the text earlier in the morning. So I didn't receive any e-mail up to 12:00, maybe it's in my e-mail box now. But that was just by the way. Then he made a proposal. He started talking about different things that he wanted to discuss and I just said what was the reason for the Suspension of Standing Orders and then he outlined the specific reason and I said is there any support for that in the Chamber and there was silence. CLLR. FORTUNE: I missed some of that. But my view is really the principle of it. One basic question he was asking for, did we receive a letter from the Minister in connection with St. Paul's? That's a simple question. Yes or no, we did or we didn't. And if we did can we get a copy of it? Very simple.
MR. CURRAN: There was an e-mail sent to me this morning from the Minister but that came in this morning.

CLLR. FORTUNE: Could that be circulated to the

Members?
MR. CURRAN: Yeah. I will check with the Minister. CATHAOIRLEACH: If there is a letter from the Minister sent to Councillors or the CE then I don't think there's any problem with us distributing that.

C11r. Fitzgerald.
CLLR. FITZGERALD: I just want to say you asked for a motion, you asked C11r. Thornhi11 to -- you asked him what he wanted in the Suspension of Standing Orders. You put it to the meeting quite clearly and he hadn't got a seconder. So you can't go ahead with it if you haven't got a seconder. You asked him and he precisely laid out what he wanted. There was no seconder and as far as I'm concerned we should move on with the agenda. There's too much of this back and forth.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I believe I dealt with the matter fairly.

CLLR. FITZGERALD: You did in a good, clear concise manner.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 1: To is consider the disposal of 14:17 a fee simple and associated lease of 21 Seafield, Wicklow Town to Mr. Sean Byrne, 21 Seafield, Wicklow down. C11r. Dunne.

CLLR. DUNNE: I propose that.
MS. GALLAGHER: Seconded?
CLLR. SNELL: I'11 second it.
MS. GALLAGHER: C11r. Sne11. Is that agreed?
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 2: To consider the disposal of
three square metres or thereabouts of land situated at Ledwidge Crescent, Bray, County wicklow, to Gas Networks Ireland, Headquarters, Gasworks Road, Cork. Have we a proposer.
CLLR. VANCE: I'11 propose it.
MS. GALLAGHER: Cl1r. Vance. Seconder?
CLLR. LAWLESS: I'11 second it.
MS. GALLAGHER: C11r. Lawless. Is that agreed?
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed.
MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhi11, you want to come in. CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. Now, when I sent you the e-mail --
CLLR. FITZGERALD: Come on, will you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Brendan, can we talk about this
afterwards.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Okay, right. Okay, i'11 go to the nub of the matter.
CLLR. FITZGERALD: Cathaoirleach, I think we should move on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Brendan --
CLLR. THORNHILL: I want to ask you a question about a disposal for clarification. Is there going to be a disposal notice in relation to St. Paul's and the salvage value of the material? Is there going to be a disposal notice given out in relation to that property? And that is all I want clarified. Simple as that. No more. No less.
MR. CURRAN: I think we've dealt with all the statutory
requirements for that project in terms of the Part 8 and the planning consent. That's all done and dusted at this stage.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach --
CLLR. VANCE: Chairman, we're on three.
CLLR. THORNHILL: There's been a disposal notice just on7y a few minutes ago for a three-by-three bit of property for $€ 600$. Now we're talking about a property here with a salvage value of hundreds of thousands of pounds..

CATHAOIRLEACH: All disposals are dealt with in the proper manner by this Council. If it requires to come as a disposal $I$ 'm sure it will be dealt with at the meeting if that's a requirement, if that's a legal requirement.
CLLR. THORNHILL: So before anything happens to St. Paul's we are going to get a disposal notice?

MR. CURRAN: what we're talking about here is a disposal of land if we're selling land. We're not selling land there. We're going through a process
whereby it's a particular project --
FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Could the County Manager use his microphone please? we cannot hear at the back.

MR. CURRAN: We we've gone through that Part 8 process.
That's now completed.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 3: To receive a presentation from the Central Statistics Office. Tony Downes is here. Tony, you're very welcome.

MR. DOWNES: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman, thank
you, Members, for inviting us this afternoon. I want to quickly give you a presentation of some of the issues that was looked at in terms of the census results for County wicklow. I am just going to run through those and tell you what the picture is in those 14:20 areas then just point you in the direction of where you can find some more information and the figures from the CSO if you have any queries or questions on that following my presentation.

So just look at the wicklow population. The population of Wicklow increased from 136,640 in 2011 to almost 142-and-a-half thousand in 2016. That was a increase of just under 6,000 or $4.2 \%$ which was compared to a national population increase of $3.8 \%$. If we just look at some of the ages breakdown of that population change.

The population of preschool children in wicklow decreased from 11,474 to 10,173 . That was a decrease of $11.3 \%$ compared to a decrease nationally of $7 \%$. So in practically every county in Ireland you've seen a decline in that 0-4 year age cohort and that's due to a decline in the birth rates over the last few years.

Looking at the other end of the spectrum then, those aged 65 and over. The national picture shows us that there was just over $19 \%$ increase in the national population aged 65 and over between 2011 and 2016. And
in wicklow there were 18-and-a-half thousand people aged 65 and over and that was a $23.8 \%$ increase in that cohort of population between 2011 and 2016. So the census is showing us a decline in the younger ages and a very significant increase in the older age groups.

The average age in wicklow in 2016 was 37.2 years. That was an increase of one-and-a-half years over the five-year period and that compares to an average nationally of 37.4 years. So wicklow is a slightly younger county than the national picture.

Looking at the housing situation. On just the top slide there. The housing stock over that 25 -year period 1991 to 2016, the population of Ireland has increased from 3.5 million to 4.7 million and that was an increase of $35 \%$. whereas the housing stock increased from 1.1 million to just over 2 million in 2016. That was an increase in the housing stock of $72.7 \%$. That's a very similar picture in wicklow. The population increase from 1991 to 2016 was 45,160 or $46.5 \%$, whereas the housing stock increased from 31,709 to almost 55,000 and that was an increase of $73.4 \%$ over those 25 years. The interesting thing about this particular aspect of the census is that we see very significant increases in the population in the late nineties and most of the first decade of this century from 2002 to 2006 and the first part of the five-year period between 2006 and 2011, a very significant
population and housing increases. But looking at the picture from 2011 to 2016 nationally the population increased by $3.8 \%$ whereas the actual housing stock only increased by $0.4 \%$ and that's the picture we see replicated in wicklow. The population increased by $4.2 \%$, whereas the actual housing stock increased only by $1.2 \%$. That's, again, a picture that's replicated in practically every county in Ireland over those five years. we're adding to the housing stock at a much lower rate than we're adding people.

Looking then just at the vacant properties which is one of the areas that we've had most interest and coverage on. Looking at the picture in wicklow in 2011 to 2016. Looking at the columns there: unoccupied houses; vacant houses; holiday homes; and flats. The vacancy, number of vacant houses in Dublin has decreased from 5,377 in 2011 to just under four-and-a-half thousand in 2016 and that was a vacancy rate of $8.1 \%$ compared to almost $10 \%$ five years previously.

The second slide underneath there just gives a breakdown of the types of the vacancy rates by type of accommodation, with the largest vacancy rates being seen in flats, vacancy rates of $10.5 \%$, for example, in a flat or apartment in a purpose built block compared to vacancy rates of about 4\% in semi-detached houses.

Moving on then to the health of the population. The
vast majority of the population in County Wicklow described their health as either very good or good. Sixty-two-and-a-half percent of those in April 2016 said their health was very good. That was almost 89,000 . In 2016, $26.2 \%$ or 37,211 people said that their health was good. Almost $88.7 \%$ of the population felt that their health was very good or good in 2016.

If you look at those who said that their health was very bad. Just 2,017 people said their health was very bad in 2016. That was $1.4 \%$ of the population. But that was a $14 \%$ increase on those who said their health was very bad in 2011. So that's probably a result of the ageing population and that's perhaps something we can expect to see increase as the population gets slightly older and you see a greater proportion of older people in the population in the censuses to come.

Just to look then at those people with a disability. We have produced a report on health, disability and carers. There were 19,244 people in the County had at least one disability in 2016 and that was an increase from 17,616 five years previously. So that was a disability rate in the County of $13.5 \%$. That was the same percentage as nationally. We have a breakdown there of the most common types of disabilities among those who had disabilities. As I say, just over 19,000 people had at least one disability and that was $13.5 \%$ of the population had a disability in County wicklow in
2016.

We also look at the number of carers in the population and in wicklow, as nationally, the number of carers have increased from just over 5,000 to 5,559 in 2016. We have an age breakdown there of the numbers of carers and how that was changed from 2011 to 2016. what's significant is that while we've seen a decline in the number of carers aged 15 and under nationally, there's actually been an increase in County wicklow from 101 carers aged 15 and under to 111 in 2016.

Looking then finally at the care hours provided by those carers and how that's changed over the five years. The carers in wicklow provided 185,330 hours of 14:28 care per week and that was an average of 38.3 care hours per carer per week. So almost a work full working week there for carers providing care to a family member or a friend or a neighbour. And that was an increase from 37.2 hours in 2011.

So the number of carers is going up but the number of care hours is also (inaudible) so there are issues there as service providers for people that we'11 have to look at.

Looking then at the area of commuting and transport times. It will be no surprise to anybody here, I'm sure, that the commuting times in the Dublin area are
the highest in the country. Wicklow is actually coming out as the second highest commuting time with a commuting time of 34 -and-a-half minutes in 2016. That was, as I say, the second highest average commuting time in the country.

If you look then at the second slide which is the average travelling distance, wicklow is about mid table there. So 18.7 to 18.8 kilometres was the average commuting distance in wicklow in 2016. So the mid table in terms of commuting distance but actually the second longest average commute which was 34.5 minutes compared to an average commuting time nationally of just over 28 minutes. So a big difference there in wicklow between the national picture and the picture in the County.

If we look then at how those people got to work, school and college. You can see that all modes of transport pretty had increased between 2011 and 2016 with an increase in population and more people at work and so on. So we've seen some small increases in the numbers of people who go to work on foot or by bike, but the vast majority of those who travel to work do so as a car driver or car passenger. $69.2 \%$ of those who go to work every day in Wicklow did so, as I say, in a car as a driver or as a passenger in 2016 and that compared to $65.6 \%$ of those who go to work in a car nationally.

We have some details then on the travelling time of those commuters and how that's changed over the five years. If you look at the first two columns there which is those travelling for 30 minutes or less, about
41.6\% of all wicklow commuters have commuting time of 30 minutes or 1ess. If you look at the other end of the spectrum, those travelling for an hour-and-a-half or more, $4.7 \%$ of all commuters in wicklow had a commuting time of 90 minutes or more and that was one in five actually of all commuters in Wicklow had a commuting time of an hour, 90 minutes or more, compared to a figure of $10 \%$ for those who had a commuting time of 90 minutes or more nationally. As I say, one in five of wicklow commuters had a commuting time of 90 minutes or more compared to just one in ten nationally.

Looking then at some of the larger towns in Wicklow and the commuting times of those people and particularly those travelling for an hour or more. You'11 see I've highlighted the figure for wicklow. Almost $22 \%$ of wicklow commuters had a travelling time of an hour or more. You'11 also notice that a number of other Wicklow towns feature with Greystones/Delgany very high. A quarter of all commuters have a commuting time of an hour or more. You'11 see Arklow featuring there. 14:32 So wicklow featuring very prominently in among those people who have commuters with very long commuting times.

Looking then at the employment picture in Wicklow and how that has changed over the five years. There were just over 59,000 people at work in the County in April 2016 and that was an increase of 6,227 or almost $12 \%$ over the five years. 8,603 people were unemployed or looking, either looking for their first regular job or having given up a previous job. That was a decline of just over 4,000 or $32 \%$ in the five-year period. That was an increase in the employment rate of $12.7 \%$ in the County in April 2016.

Looking now at the category of the retired people. As we saw earlier, a very significant increase in the numbers of 65 and over. So that's been reflected in the numbers who said that they were retiring in 2016. That gave us a figure of 15,722 people retired in wicklow in April 2016 and that was an increase of 22.4\% in the numbers of retired people in that five-year period.

Where do those people work then? what sectors do they work in? The largest industrial sector in terms of employment in the County is the wholesale/retail trade which accounted for 8,140 workers in 2016. That was $13.8 \%$ of all those at work.

The second largest was the human, health and social work facilities categories which was $10.8 \%$ or 6,387 workers.

The top five then was completed by education which accounted for $9 \%$ of all workers in the County in April 2016. Manufacturing, which was 4,920 workers or $8.3 \%$. Professional, scientific and technical activities which was 3,866 workers or $6.5 \%$. Another figure to note there is the number employed in the construction sector which increased from 2,677 in 2016 to 3,483 people in 2016. So an increase of $5.9 \%$. Sorry, $5.9 \%$ of al1 workers in the County were employed in the construction sector in April 2016. So it's a very significant increase there and that's a picture that we see nationally. In fact it starts to recover from the crash of the late noughties and early part of this decade.

Looking then at how many people work in the County and come into the County for work. In April 2016 there were 23,871 wicklow residents working in the County; 23,500 wicklow residents were commuting out of the County; and 8,680 people were commuting into the County for work on a daily basis. So that gives us a net outflow of workers from the County of 14,771. So almost 15,000 people leaving the County every day to work.

Again, the slide underneath looks at the breakdown for some of the larger areas in the County. Significant outflows there in Bray, Greystones. Slightly less movement in Arklow and wicklow and again very
significant outflow in Blessington in terms of the working population there, for example. Let's look at that in more detail.

The first slide here shows us that in 2016 every county in the country and in the six counties had at least one worker from wicklow working in it in 2016. We also have some figures there for people who were working in the UK and other countries abroad and how that has changed over the five years. And again just look at some of the breakdown of some of the larger towns in the County and where those workers are working. For example, in Bray 6,292 of the 13,835 workers were working in Dublin. So almost half, $45.4 \%$ of workers in Bray were working in the Dublin area. That's a figure we see replicated in Greystones where $48.4 \%$ of all workers were working in Dublin City and suburbs. Wicklow Town itself, $28.5 \%$ of all workers were working in Dublin City and suburbs. In Blessington $45.1 \%$ of all workers were working in Dublin City and suburbs. so, again, reflecting that picture of a very large commuting outflow from wicklow to the Dublin area on a daily basis in 2016.

Just to look then finally at some of the innovations we ${ }_{14: 37}$ have introduced for the 2016 Census and the report on employment, occupations, industry which was the final report we produced at the end of 2016. We have introduced a new geographical level of information
called workplace zones and there are fully interactive maps on the CSO website. I'11 point you in their direction in a minute. You can zoom in on these individual workplace zones and you can find out how many people were working in that area on a daily basis; how did they get to work, whether they travelled by car, public transport, how many people walked, how many people cycled and so on. You can see what industries they are working in. Whether it be retail or finance or agriculture and so on, all the main industries will be listed there. So we had information, as I say, on how they got to work, what areas they are working in and also we have some information on their nationality. So you'11 see the main nationality groups are broken down there. So there's a lot of new information in those interactive maps on workplace zones as to, as I say, how many people were working in that area, how have they got to the area, what sectors they were working in and what their nationality was.

So this is the census results page on the cso website. we produced 13 reports over the course of last year; two summary reports; and 11 individual reports on issues such as housing, employment, as I say, which was the last report last year. We produced a report on the 14:38 non-Irish national population. And we also produced a report, as I highlighted a few minutes ago, on health, disability and carers. So all those reports are freely accessible on the cso website. I have some links here
which will take you to the individual reports. They are all listed there. Each individual report has a series of chapters in it. The chapters contain detailed interactive maps and graphs. we also have reports and details of information on small area population statistics and the stat bank. There are 12 different layers of geography in the small area population statistics. So that is from county level right town to Electoral Area, Local Electoral Area, small areas which are an area population of about 80 to 14:39 120 houses and if you use that link there that will take you in. Again, it brings you into an interactive map where you can select any particular you want to. A few clicks of a button and it will give you all the census results for that area. So you can see how many people live in the area, what their age profile is, what their gender profile is, what their nationality profile is and so on. Perhaps the one part of the slide that I've actually drawn your attention to most is the contact details for the census itself there. You have an e-mail address there and a telephone number there which if anybody has any queries on the census results or any parts of it, if you're looking for something that you can't find, we can point you in the direction of it or if it's something new, some 14:40 additional results that we can provide for you that isn't provided on the website at the moment, we can look at that as well.

So I will invite you just to, in your own time, just to follow those links there. As I say, there's a wealth of information there. It's all freely available. Just a few clicks will get you to the information you need. As I say, if you're looking for something that isn't on the website give us an e-mail or a phone call and we'd be very happy to answer any queries you have or to point you in the direction of whatever information you're looking for.

Thank you very much, as I say, and feel free to come back to us at any time if you've any queries on the census results.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Tony, thanks very much. Could I ask that those links that you just highlighted there, that they be sent to us. I'm not sure if they're on the minute pad or not, what was circulated to us already. CLLR. WHITMORE: They are.
CATHAOIRLEACH: oh, they are. Great okay. Tony, there's just one or two speakers. C11r. Matthews. CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks for the presentation, Tony. Just one of the figures you gave there is on vacant properties in the County about four-and-a-half-thousand units, somewhere between eight and ten percent. So the question $I$ have is, is there a 14:41 normal figure for vacancy rates that, you know, OECD figures, something like that? If you take that figure and you think about it, if we addressed half of those vacant properties and brought them back into
circulation we'd actually fulfil our Housing List in the County. of course building new houses is going to be part of a solution, but it's about helping bring vacant and derelict properties back into use again is also going to be a very important part of dealing with the Housing List and homelessness. Are we somewhere normal 8 to $10 \%$ nationally and, say, on OECD figures? MR. DOWNES: Yeah. I think the national figure is $12.5 \%$ in April 2016 so wicklow is actually well below and has been consistently over the 25 -year period I've shown there. As I said, there was an increase in the early 2000s with the rate of expansion in the housing sector. We have seen and we will have seen in the early part of this century an increase nationally in the vacancy rate, the numbers of vacant houses. But as 14:42 part of the analysis within the report on housing and, in particular, on vacant housing, we looked at houses that were houses and flats and apartments that would have been vacant in 2011 and occupied in 2016 and vice versa and we actually have a vacancy chapter on the Housing Report that explains in detail how we came to those figures and how, as I say, looking particularly at housing units that were vacant five years ago and are occupied now, what the reasons were for the changes and the staff of those housing units. As I say, we also looked at housing units that might have been occupied five years ago but are vacant now.

There is some information there on how we went about it
and what the reasons for vacancies were. As I say, the vacancy rate has come down quite significantly nationally but wicklow has been consistently below the vacancy rate compared to the national picture, as I say, over that 25 -year period

CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Blake.
CLLR. BLAKE: Thanks for the presentation. Just in relation to the number in the smaller areas, the small towns and villages that we would be representing rather 14:44 than Bray and Greystones, the actual demand for housing in those particular areas, do you have a breakdown of those? And an equally so, you talk about the people commuting from predominantly North Wicklow and the bigger towns, but is there people actually commuting into the County in other areas and do we have any figures regarding that? And my last point is, I've looked up those figures in the past but they haven't been up. Is this only up lately on the statistics website?

MR. DOWNES: We started to produce the results from the census in April. So about 12 months ago we produced the first report which was the first summary report. And then between April and December last year we would have produced the list of reports that I showed up there now of census results and they're all available on the CSO website through the census page. If you click onto cso.ie there's an area down the
right-hand side, there's a census page there. That will take you on to the list of reports which are showed there. If you click on any individual report there it will bring you into the actual individual report where all the details are contained. So, as I say, there's individual chapters there, there's fully interactive maps and graphs and charts, fully interactive tables and all the information is up there.

In terms of the housing, demand housing situation, the Housing Report does look at, say, the housing composition. So one of the things that the Housing Report told us was that the household size has increased for the first time in over 30 years, I think. That is a reflection of the decline in the construction sector. So we have looked at, say, what the household size is and you can get breakdowns for each of the individual areas. So that the 12 individual geographical levels that $I$ mentioned on the stat map, which is the second link there, you can go in and see what the household composition is for those areas. So how it's changing. You can expect to see that generally the household sizes are increasing so that shows us that there is a demand for housing there. One of the things that emerged from the census as well was 14:46 that there's almost half a million adult children living at home in 2016. That's a huge increase from 2011 to 2016. So, again, that's a reflection of the fact that we're not adding housing units at the same
rate as the population is increasing at. That's coming through as issue there as well.

Your other question was in terms of people commuting. We have, both on the commuting report and the employment report we have some very detailed maps and charts which go down to electoral division level and lower. It shows you how many people are working in that area; whether they're living in that area; whether they're commuting in; how they commute in and out, so whether they are in their car or they are a public transport user and so on so. Again, there are some very detailed figures there available, as I say, right down to the very small local levels. You can see exactly how many people are working in the area, where they're working in and how they get to and from their workplaces every day.

It's all there, , as I say, in your own time if you're looking for it and you can't find it use the contact details there. We'11 point you in the direction if it's there and if it's something that isn't there, that we can provide for you, we're more than happy to do that as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Murphy.
CLLR. MURPHY: I'm actually quite shocked on the statistics on disability. I'm just wondering is it both down to age and, you know, category like that? MR. DOWNES: Yeah. On the Disability Report, that was
just sort of a top level breakdown that I gave you there. We would have a more detailed breakdown by age and gender and so on as to, as I say, what the disabilities, whether it's males and females and the age groups. So there is a lot of information there on the disability report.

CLLR. MURPHY: Is that also covering the need for housing, education, transport? Does it breakdown to that narrow -- do you know what I mean? Disability covers all sections.
MR. DOWNES: Sure. We have a list of disabilities there. There's a detailed breakdown of the types of disability that people have. We look at where people are living; whether they're in houses; whether they're leaving in communal establishments, such as nursing homes and so on. So there is some information there on that issue all right.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Is there a link, though, between access to, say, transport data for disability?
MR. Downes: we don't have that, not that I'm aware of, 14:49 at the moment, but if, say -- have a look at the individual reports. If there's something you're looking for that isn't there that we can derive from the census results, you can give us a shout and we can try and work something out for you. There is quite detailed information there, as I say, on disability as to the breakdown by age and gender and so on.

CLLR. MURPHY: It is very difficult to get a precise because there is no national data or registration, do
you know what I mean?
MR. DOWNES: Yeah. You are depending on people as well to give you that information. For valid reasons perhaps people mightn't be willing to do that. The census is probably the most comprehensive picture you wil1 get.

CLLR. MURPHY: And it could be higher than it actually is stated.

MR. DOWNES: Yeah. I mean as the figures show, there is an increase and that's probably to be expected with an aging population. But disability organisations, some would say, for example, that's still an underrepresentation for various reasons you know. CLLR. MURPHY: Thanks for that. CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Walsh.

CLLR. WALSH: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, and thanks, Tony for your presentation, $I$ think the figures there are starker than what we see day-to-day what's happening on the ground. The figures will become very useful for our planners and our housing people et cetera. Just
the 3.8 population increase as against 1.2 housing stock increase tells its own story. It's interesting to see that we still have four-and-a-half thousand vacant houses and so again, there's a lot in those figures to work on.

The challenges are our aging population and the challenges that will bring in relation to health et cetera is another matter that we are going to have to
address.

Unfortunately, as we see, we're the second highest commuting time in the country which we see again day-to-day on our roads in relation to that. And of course we have a number of adult children living at home. So these are all the issues that people are being faced within on a day-to-day basis. As I say it bears out what's happening in reality. Thank you. CATHAOIRLEACH: That's everybody. Tony, thanks again very much.

MR. DOWNES: Thank you very much. I'm delighted to hear from you if you have any further questions or follow-up. Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Next item on the agenda Item 4: To consider the Arklow and Environs Local Area Plan 2018-2024, Draft Ministerial Direction 2018 and to note the views and recommendations of the Elected Members. MR. CURRAN: That's been circulated in relation to a direction on two different issues. One is in relation the North Sea Road and the other is Ballynattin, which was zoned for tourism. So the direction is to remove both.

Members already had a chance to make a submission directly to the Minister. It's gone on public display. We'11 be summarising the issues that are raised during that consultation process and any issues that are raised today will form part of that as well.

MR. O'BRIEN: Just on this, the Executive don't make any comments on the consultation period. Our job is purely to synopsise what's said and send it up to the Department. There's no recommendation required. We do ask a recommendation of how the direction would be effected. But in this case the direction is to take out those two parcels of land. So we can't add to that. So nothing really (inaudible) has been asked but anything you say today will be taken down and sent to the Department, but not be used against you! CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Bourke.

CLLR. BOURKE: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I'd just like to clarify for the Members the background to this. I know C11r. Fitzgerald wanted to speak on this but he has had to leave urgently. First of all, in relation to the land at Sea Bank, it has come as a great surprise to the Councillors that this has occurred that the Minister has taken this position. This particular piece of land at Sea Bank has been zoned by the County Manager since originally 1999 in the Development Plan, the County Development Plan at that stage. It was, again, in the subsequent plan's rezoning, it was amended to include part of it as residential and part of it as employment zoning. And that particular zoning was carried through I think two or three successive Development Plans, Local Area Plans. So it's quite surprising to us, the Councillors, that the Minister has taken this line.

The guidelines that he cites for rejecting it this time are the 2007 Planning Guidelines which would have pertained to the previous plans and he's using the same barometer now to reject it this time. There's an inconsistency there in his approach.

So they were -- as I say, again, they've have that zoning attached since 1999. The only reason they weren't developed was because the lack of a public infrastructural sewer, which having planned and promised for the Sea Bank site, right adjacent to this particular zone. Unfortunately that was beaten by in the High Court through successive judicial reviews and, as you know, Irish water have gone to a different site location now for the sewage treatment plant. So we believe that it's unfair for the Minister to be taking this approach at this particular time and this zone should be left in place.

Similarly, in relation to the Ballynattin zoning. There was planning permission granted on that site which was zoned in, I think, two Development Plans again or two Local Area Plans ago for tourism development. The planning expired. It wasn't built because of the crash in 2007. The owner of that site has assured me that he has a planning application ready to go and that he has a hotel developer ready to build a hotel on that site which will create employment during construction and operation. So it will be the
feeling of the Councillors that that should be given a chance as well and be left in.

So that's the position in relation to those two submissions, those two zonings that the Minister wants left out. We would strongly oppose it and I'd like that to be put on the record.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr. Annesley.
CLLR. ANNESLEY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, first and foremost, thank you to the Executive for not making a comment on this today, you're allowed to at this stage but thank you for your team for all the hard work you put into this.

First and foremost Cllr. Bourke has said a lot of what I want to see, but I have wrote to the Minister on this one. I CC'd the Council. First and foremost on the Ballynattin site, the precedent was set there in the last Development Plan. Secondly, the planning permission was granted there for a hote1 and as
cl1r. Bourke said, the Councillors feel it should be left in tourism because it's vital for Arklow. And speaking to one of the officials on Friday, Mr. Cousins, he said to me, off the record, that he feels that the town needs a hotel in the Town Centre. well, in 2002 a hotel went for planning permission in the Town Centre and the Planning Authority then said, no, Arklow wasn't big enough for a hotel of that size in the Town Centre. Now he's speaking out both sides
of his mouth here because he wanted it in the Town Centre and now he doesn't want it in the Town Centre. Now we have a developer here going to build a hotel, a 220-bedroom hote1 which no town in the country would turn down in this day in the economy and we're saying, no, you can't build it there. This man has a backer to come on and build a hote1. So I think this zoning should be left in and we should be given the green light to this because we welcome it. If you look at the east coast, we're short on bedrooms. There's 134 bedrooms in the Arklow area tonight and it's not big enough for a town that size. Take westport, for example, that town is flourishing because of all the hotel rooms it has. we need this development in Arklow.

Thank you very much, Des.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I have no other speakers.
CLLR. BEHAN: Sorry, Chairman.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, C11r. Behan.
CLLR. BeHAN: I know I missed what Cllr. Annesley said but I know the Arklow Members would strongly disagree with what the Minister has done here. But I would disagree also on a point of principle and I've said it before and I'11 say it again. Development Plans were supposed to be the Councillors' plans. We were supposed to set the policy. But time after time the Minister of the day - and it doesn't have to be one minister, it's been a number of them - come in, sail in
over our heads and give directions that they won't accept our democratically arrived at decisions. For what it's worth I think the Minister should be told to give the powers back to the Councillors to make the decisions on the Development Plan and allow democracy to work. I'm not getting into the specific issues but I'm making the general point.
while I have the floor, Cathaoirleach, if we're sending back any message to the Minister, I would also like to send a message of rejection to this disgraceful circular that we got on 9th March forbidding us from commenting on a planning application ever again at a Council meeting either at a Municipal District meeting, Area meeting or a Council meeting. It's absolutely outrageous and antidemocratic that we, as elected representatives, are being told by the Minister that we can never raise a planning issue to do with a current planning file at any Council meeting in the future. I think he has really pushed Councillors to the limit now with regard to saying to them that effectively he doesn't want us involved in planning and commenting on planning, supporting a planning application, opposing it, unless we actually make a formal submission.

I fundamentally disagree with that circular. I think it's an antidemocratic, it's anti Councillor and it's also very much opposed to the job that we are supposed to do, which is to represent the people of our
communities. And for what it's worth I think we should strongly condemn the Minister for basically telling us to keep our mouths shut when it comes to planning in the future. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, thank you. Item 5: To adopt Scheme of Letting Priorities, (copy draft scheme and letter from SEO Housing has been attached). Jackie is going to give a presentation.
MS. CARROLL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. All the Members were circulated with the Scheme of Letting Priorities and an accompanying letter detailing why we chose to review the Scheme. Sorry. We'11 start again...
we undertook a review of the Scheme of Letting Priorities and there are a couple of reasons for that. One was the scheme was last reviewed in 2011. The first slide is just, if you like, a background to where we are obliged to actually have a scheme of letting priorities.

The objective of the Scheme is to determine the order of priority when we're allocating houses and also to determine the order of priority when households transfer to another dwelling, when we try to optimise the use of stock.

The current scheme, as I said, was last reviewed in 2011. We have two schemes in operation in the County, Bray and wicklow. So we had to streamline and
amalgamate both schemes to make it fit for purpose. We had to reference choice-based letting as an option for allocation. We had to include the new Housing Assistance Payment Scheme and we decided it was timely to review all the allocation policies. So the point systems, succession of tenancy policy, priority status, et cetera.

Just as regards consideration of the Applicants. As you're aware, all applicants are considered for
allocation based on the points system and/or the priority status. Specific accomodation may be retained for applicants with specific needs. For example, the elderly or disability, when ground floor accommodation comes back into stock. Obviously we have to have regard to applicants who have been engaging in anti-social behaviour, which is why we always look for a garda check before allocation. We can refuse or defer lettings on those grounds.

The points system. We did make some changes to the points system. Generally, all things being equal, length of time on the waiting list determined your priority when we're due to allocate. However, there are exceptional circumstances where we have priority status and we can apply extra points for that. For example, unfit, overcrowding. The length of time waiting is priority status which is listed elsewhere. In exceptional circumstances, elderly, homeless, et
cetera. Then we look at people who occupy unfit dwellings, overcrowding. Extra points are allocated also for living and working in the area.

The priority status element. Priority applicants may be given preference over other applicants so they may be allocated extra points. We have made provision for that in the Scheme. They is accepted in circumstances where, for example, people living in dangerous properties; displacement resulting from acts of a Local Authority; families or persons rendered homeless through no fault of their own; homelessness; exceptional medical or compassionate grounds. Exceptional medical or compassionate grounds, we would require a consultant's report, et cetera. And persons aged 60 or older for older person's accommodation.

Other issues we looked at in the Scheme was when somebody refuses an offer of accomodation. That's set down in legislation. Transfers; mutual transfers; succession tenancy. Applicants who are coming on to the list who had former tenancies and may have abandoned profits or left arrears on the properties. We also look at (inaudible) management grounds.

The main changes were that for transfers we increased the time that the tenant was required to be in the property from one year to two years. That's simply because of the huge administration and obviously an
ability to see how they actually embedded into the estates. Succession of tenancy, the changes there. We had presented to the SPC. We had looked for five years that somebody would have to be declared (inaudible) for five years. The SPC asked us to amend that to three years. So we fee1 that that's appropriate going forward and we have changed that to three years. obviously when somebody makes a case to succeed to a tenancy we have to make sure that the property meets their needs. There may be over-occupancy, in which case we would look, if we're going to honour their application for tenancy we would look at moving them to a smaller property and taking back the large property, just to maximise stock.

We added in HAP, as I say, and then we looked at the points system. Now because we have generally a length of time list, we did change, we added in an extra 10 points for over 11 years and over. A11 things being equal, people -- because of the length of time that some people are on the list in current circumstances of over ten years, we have people on the list 13 years, 14 years so we wanted to actually make that apparent that they would actually get extra points for that because the maximum was five to ten years and in the current climate that's not necessarily enough.

The priority status, As i said, extra points can be allocated in exceptional circumstances and I've listed
them out to you. I would ask that -- the SPC has recommended to the full Council with that one amendment. We feel that it's fit for purpose and we feel that it includes all the issues that we need to be mindful of and relevant to the property. So I would ask that the Members would agree to adopt the Scheme. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Jackie. C11r. Snel1.
CLLR. SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks to Jackie for her presentation. The SPC has gone over this document over a number of meetings and as Jackie has outlined, there was a number of issues which the SPC identified and asked for changes. This is in collaboration with the Bray Housing Section, as we all know since 2014 with the abolition of the Town Councils where most Town Councils had their own housing unit it was felt that it's time to tighten up and put in a better policy in regards to the Scheme of Letting Priorities.

The SPC were quite happy with the authorisations and the suggestions that's been brought to the Chamber here today. The reason for putting it here in front of the Members is obviously for members to have their say on it and vote appropriately and, as I say, most of the SPC have looked at this in huge detail.

In regards to the County, we do know that Bray has a special status in regards to their Scheme of Letting in
regards to it's three sections to it. The Bray (inaudible) is broken down into three sections. So I think the officials and the SPC were very mindful of that in regards to this document. So I'd be interested in listening to the questions but I certainly will be supporting this and I hope all Members will be the same. I think it's important at this moment in time. Probably no one ever envisaged that people would be on the Housing List for more than ten years. So it's important to reflect that in this document that unfortunately there is people who are over ten years and I think to put in that safeguard of an extra ten points for ten years plus is very important in regards to distinguishing people's rights in regards trying to gather up extra points. And also in regards to the transfer, we have to be mindful in regards to the huge pressure that the staff are under in regards to time consumption. Every Elected Member of this Chamber will be quite conscious that at the moment the Housing Section are dealing with the housing needs assessment for 2018 and that's a huge body of works as well.

So, as I say, I would be proposing this, Cathaoirleach, to all the Members and, as I say, I hope that everyone sees the merits within this new document. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, C11r. Snel1. Could I just make one comment before I go round to the other members because other Members are on the SPC and know this
document a lot better than I do, but just one thing that strikes me about it is, on the length of time on the waiting list that five to ten years has exactly the same points. So someone on the Housing List for ten years gets 25 points and someone on the Housing List for five years gets 25 . Surely there should be a little bit of distinction there, I would have thought, like an increment of maybe two points per year or something. It shoots up 4-5 five points, 3-4 five points, then you get to five years and you're stuck there for five more years, till ten years, actually six years to 11 years before you go up at a11. Someone on it ten-and-a-half years has the same points as someone on it five years. That strikes me as being a little bit unfair. I think there should be some increment given to someone who's on it up to ten years as opposed to someone who's on it five years. Cllr. Lawless. CLLR. LAWLESS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks, Jackie, for the presentation. I had a good read of the document. I have to say it's a very good working
document. Maybe just one comment on it and it's in and around people that will present to you with domestic violence. I presume that falls under the priority status. I know it's not specifically mentioned because I do realise when people actually present homeless, it 15:11 is no fault of their own as such. So I'm just wondering does that need to be included maybe somewhere in it or is it a standalone because I don't know whether it is appropriate to have it in this particular
document. I'm glad to see that cohesively being done between Bray and Wicklow as well. It's all going to be the one policy for both Councils. Just in regards to that, so I'm just wondering, and again it probably doesn't apply to this document, but like I mentioned earlier, just the rent for wicklow, as it stands, I think the cap is something like 250 a week and that was the most you could pay but Bray had no limit. I'm just worked will this be something that the Housing Department will look at if you're trying to cohesively have Bray and wicklow as the same kind of policy across the board?

Other than that I think it's a very, very good working document and I'd be very happy to support it to today. So well done to the housing staff.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. Behan.
CLLR. BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, I certainly would be happy to second it. As a member of the SPC could I just thank the Chairman and Jackie and the staff for the amount of work that they put into the production of this document. We actually had two full meetings, discussions on it. So we spent a lot of time considering all the ins and outs of it and I think what we ended up is a very good document. One of the most important things about it, I think it is very readable and accessible. I know Gráinne, I think Gráinne had a lot to do with that. I don't know whether she's there or not but I know she did a lot of the detailed work on
getting it to be a readable document, which I think is very, very important. Because people who apply to go on the Housing List will be entitled to receive this document and see what are our priorities when it comes to allocating houses.
of course the big point is that for many people who are on the Housing List now at the moment, in all parts of wicklow it's a completely irrelevant document because there's so few houses being allocated. That's a sad fact of life in wicklow at the moment, as we all know. I take the Chairman's point about the difference between the five years and the ten years and that's something we actually discussed at the meeting. But in reality for some people, particularly in Bray, they are 15:13 people in Bray 14 years on the Housing List at the moment and they have not been offered a house yet. I think the ten years, giving the extra points for people who are ten years or longer was an attempt to address the really extremely long periods of time that some people are having to spend on the list. But the bottom line is that we need to build more houses and we need them fast. From that point of view I suppose we just have to continue to support the Housing Department, Joe Lane, and the staff in getting ahead with the
Housing Programme that we have. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Vance.
CLLR. VANCE: Chairman, thank you. My experience on
letting priorities, Chairman, would be, and I don't know - I went out for a second so I don't know if I missed this or not - there has to be a flexibility in regard to letting as well because you can't be rigidly going down the various in regard to the points system. I know there's all sorts of different permutations that has to be taken into consideration in special circumstances and there has to be that flexibility as well as far as I'm concerned. There generally has been, I have to say that, I haven't come across really people being inflexible with regard to allocation, particularly over specific issues and serious issues on behalf of families and stuff like that.

The other thing that concerns me as well, letting, I suppose it comes within the letting properties, I'm seriously concerned about the time factor that is taken by the Council in regard to going after people in an illegal occupation of Council houses. That I know instances where it's taken up to three years before, even though the Council would have known about illegal occupation of various things like that, and before we get before the courts and then we have a serious, serious problem then because people may have (inaudible) for that particular time. That's an issue that I believe needs to be handled and needs to be handled urgently as well. Effectively what we're doing is, there's a huge waiting list out there and some people, by virtue of families dying and various things
like that and occupation of people who haven't been in the house for years and all sorts of things that can happen and people leaving houses and reletting them privately to other people, when that actually happens, that we have been lax, to my knowledge anyway, in following that up and dealing with it on a fairly quick basis because the longer we get on, the more difficult it is to go to the courts to get them back. Thank you, Chairman.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Blake.
CLLR. BLAKE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. As a member of the SPC I would like to compliment the staff on the work they've done in regards to this particular programme and I certainly do believe that we should support it.

A couple of issues with regard to the whole thing and in particular with regard to the anti-social behaviour and allocating houses to people who have a history of anti-social behaviour, even on a temporary basis it has 15:17 to be a concern. Particularly so, I wasn't aware of the fact, as C11r. Vance has alluded to, illegal occupation of Local Authority housing. My experience of that is that the Council have a very firm line on people that are occupying houses illegally. From my own experience anyway, a couple happened in our own area, the Council have been very firm in dealing with them so I would like to compliment them in that regard. Certainly, anti-social behaviour is a serious issue out
there and occupying houses illegally has to be resisted as well. I certainly would be supporting the efforts the staff have done. Thank you, Chairman. CATHAOIRLEACH: That's everyone one now. Back to Jackie.

MS. CARROLL: C11r. Sne11 mentioned a few words on Bray and how mindful we were of that. We took from the SPC, it was mentioned in the SPC that Bray was unique in that way in that the areas of preference for somebody who goes on the Council Housing List in Bray you have a preference within Bray so we accepted that. That's nothing to do with the allocation process, that's to do with the application process, to actually apply for it. So that still remains the same. we may actually rename them but they're historic names but we're not going to change the actual -- some people want to live one side of the bridge and some people want to be on the other side of the bridge.

The HNA, just to mention that in case I don't get to mention it, the last of the applications have gone out today for the HNA. We've issued over 3,500 applications. Applicants who have been assessed since 2015 will not be sent out a housing application because they are not part of this review. There is a huge volume of work to be done. Every single application will be looked at and reviewed and updated. So just bear with us on this.

The length of time on the list, and the Cathaoirleach has mentioned five to ten years. Yes, we can certainly look at that in that we can allocate a point per year after the five, between five and ten and $I$ think that will work if the Councillors are agreed.

Domestic violence, C11r. Lawless, you mentioned that in relation to -- that's actually in relation to homelessness. I think we have actually referred to it in detail with regards to people presenting as being domestic violence and presenting as homeless and we have actually worked around that through emergency accommodation and we have spoken. At the SPC again we had submissions from the women's refuges on people actually leaving tenancies and the legalities around that but that's not a matter for the allocation process.

CLLR. LAWLESS: That's what I was wondering. MS. CARROLL: But it is certainly something that's to the forefront of our mind and we're working very closely with the refuges on that.

You mentioned the rent for wicklow. Again, we had intended to amalgamate the two schemes. We do have a Bray scheme and a Wicklow scheme. To actually
amalgamate the two schemes would mean some would be up and some would be down. So because of the -- we're told the advent of the National Differential Rent Scheme we're going to wait for that. So we're still
hopeful that that is being raised at a higher 1eve1. I think there are only seven counties that would be impacted negatively but that's being dealt with at a higher level than here. We feel that there's no point in changing the scheme twice. At the moment it works quite well.

C11r. Behan, yes, I just want to pay tribute to Gráinne. A huge amount of work has gone into this. An to Trina for her cooperation. We worked very closely with Bray on this. It is readable and accessible and we cut it down by half because there was a lot of gumpf that we didn't need in it.

Very few houses being allocated. We11, that will obviously improve. I think Gráinne is full-time allocating at the moment so that's a really good sign for 2018.

C11r. Vance mentioned flexibility in regard to letting and you'11 see on page 2 , and it is something that we apply all the time, there is discretion in making an allocation. Something may come about that may not necessarily be defined in the scheme and we will make a decision on that and the chief Executive has a discretionary role in the Scheme of Letting Priorities.

Illegal occupation. Yes, there have been issues with getting people out of houses. Sometimes it's with the
courts in that if by gaining an eviction we're actually making somebody homeless so as a Housing Authority we have to sit on both sides of that. We are making it a priority at the moment. Sometimes it's actually more effective to rehouse the person in maybe a one-bed until we regain the family home back. We have anecdotal evidence of people looking for permission to preside on their way to a funeral. I mean that's how some people want to succeed into tenancies. We are making a priority of that and we have a few cases in the legal department at the moment.

Reletting, yeah, that's dealt with.

Cl1r. Blake mentioned about anti-social behaviour. Certainly as regards allocations, we tend to get garda reports and we can defer/refuse allocations. There have been instances, to which he refers, it will be a temporary emergency accomodation. So it wouldn't necessarily be a full allocation, it would be an emergency allocation which isn't catered for under the Scheme of Letting Priorities as such.

If the Members are agreed and if we look at revising the five to ten point per year or whatever within that, we could certainly amend that to reflect the years on the list, as the Cathaoirleach has recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If the SPC people are agreeable to that point. C11r. Sne11.

CLLR. SNELL: Yes, Cathaoirleach, I would be proposing that to take on board your observation and I think it's a valid point.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Fox, you wanted to come in. CLLR. FOX: Just on a point of information, I don't want to hold up the meeting. Just on the HNAs. We, as Councillors, all the time get people who come to us who have fallen off the list when the assessments have been done and change of addresses or whatever, for whatever reason. How much flexibility will there be? what sort 15:23 of percentage of people, first of a11, fall off the list when you do an assessment like this? Secondly, will there be flexibility if somebody comes back, having fallen off the list, but has been on the list for a number of years, you know, through maybe no fault 15:23 of their own, through change of address or whatever just didn't realise that the whole list was being reassessed. Will there be flexibility?
MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I think the last time we did a full assessment we had 800 out of 2,600 applicants didn't return their application. We've given a closing date of 20th Apri1. After that a second letter will go out. If we don't get a response then we will e-mail them; we will phone them; we will write to their family home, if we can find that on the file. Absolutely every avenue will be explored. Every Councillor here has it on their social media site from what $I$ can see. So there's no lack of trying to contact people. If applicants - and we have emphasised the change of
address issue. If applicants have changed their address since they have last been in touch with the Council we need to know because other than that we might not be able to contact you if your phone number isn't valid, if your family home isn't mentioned. So it's really important to get that word out, to change your address.

If even after all that applicants don't return the form there will be flexibility and we have proven that. we have taken applicants back if there has been extenuating circumstances and that they didn't come back to us in time. So we will look at each case on its own merits. Generally, we're very flexible. I think last time we left it open for six months and that, we felt, was time enough now. Like unless you're out of the country I don't think there would be any reason for you not to be getting in touch with us. CATHAOIRLEACH: So we have a proposal from C11r. Snell to adopt what's is in front of us with the slight proviso that from six years to ten years you get an extra point. So six years would be 26 points; seven years would be 27 points; eight years would be 28; nine years would be 29; and ten years would be 30 points. Just go up a point each year.
MS. CARROLL: Yeah, we can do that.
MS. GALLAGHER: C11r. Behan seconded it.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Behan, are you still happy to second that?

CLLR. BEHAN: Yeah.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Is that agreed by the Members?
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed, yeah.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thanks. Item 6: To consider the Chief Executive's Month7y Management Report.

MR. CURRAN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, some of the high1ights there. The contract has been signed for the Florentine Centre. The planning permission has been approved for the Ashford Film Studios' €90 million extension. The Heritage Plan was officially launched. The new web portal has now gone live. We'll do an official launch of that along with the Tourism Strategy. The Tourism Strategy is nearly completed. And the NTA allocation has been outlined. Nothing else is there. I will take it as read unless there's any questions.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Lawless.
CLLR. LAWLESS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, I just have a quick question, $I$ just note here. Just in regards to the public lighting. It seems it is taking forever to change bulbs. I know in Bray they had a policy where they knew the life expectancy of the bulbs were coming so they'd go out with a team. Now they're waiting for the bulb to blow. I know myself just you were reporting to Airtricity and some areas are in darkness for weeks and weeks on end. I just wondering what's happening with that.
CATHAOIRLEACH: There was a report following a query by Cl1r. Behan. There was a report by Sean Quirke's
office about a month or two ago.
CLLR. MCDONALD: Could you circulate it?
CLLR. LAWLESS: It is probably there.
MR. CURRAN: we will re-circulate the report. There is a summary there of what we're doing and there will be a ${ }^{5: 27}$ national scheme in terms of replacing poles and lights, LED lights will be coming on stream. But I don't know, Sean, do you want to comment on it?
mR. QUIRKE: I suppose the level of faults has gone from 615 down to 250 this morning so there has been substantial improvement on that and we want to get it down below that again. we also would like to do an overall programme to replace the LED lights. As the Chief Executive said, there is a national scheme on the way and hopefully finance will come with that. In terms of energy usage and in terms of our (inaudible) is to replace them all.
CLLR. LAWLESS: Thanks, Sean.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. Matthews.
CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just one, this
is the Manager's is report?
CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah.
CLLR. MATTHEWS: I just note that you congratulated the staff on the new website and I have to agree with you I think it looks very well and it seems to be a very seamless transition. Congratulations to everybody involved in that.

Just one of the things you highlight in the report is
on littering and the number of fines issued for littering is 15 in the last month. Does that include fines for people caught dog fouling and not cleaning up after dogs? Because I really think it is something I would ask you to put more resources into provision of litter wardens or dog wardens, whatever it would be, because we found in Bray, did you see the figures for parking income has gone up quite a lot in Bray when we had traffic wardens brought in. I think if you brought in litter wardens or dog wardens, throughout the
County, I think they would almost be self-financing. I think it's something that you should consider. You can do that in a number of fines in Bray in a day. MR. CURRAN: We'11 have a look at that. It's difficult to prove, needless to say, and it takes a lot of enforcement.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. McLough1in.
CLLR. MCLOUGHLIN: Thank you. Thanks for your report. Manager, this isn't actually to do with the report itself but I think it is something that you need to take on board with regards to an incident that happened on the DART line between Greystones and Bray last Thursday night. At around 9:35 the train stopped in the middle of the tunnel and passengers were stuck for three hours. My problem is, what would happen if there 15:29 was a fire? what would happen if somebody went into labour? what would happen if somebody got seriously sick? The response from Iarnród Éireann was absolutely appalling. I just think, in this day and age, it was

12:40 before another train came in to take those passengers back to Bray. I think it is something we need to look at. I think we need to look at the whole safety of issue of trains between Bray and Greystones. we have a real issue with the tunnel itself and potential problems that can occur because of flooding et cetera, et cetera. So I just think it's such a serious issue, it's something that we need you as County Manager, Frank, to take on board if at all possible.
MR. CURRAN: We'11 take it up with Iarnród Éireann. We would have protocols from a fire point of view, et cetera, in place anyway but we'11 have another look at it.

CLLR. McLOUGHLIN: Being stuck for three hours, as you can imagine, was just too serious.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thanks, Members. Item 7. Sorcha, has been sitting patiently for about three months now. She finally gets to speak. To receive a presentation on the National Planning Framework.
MS. WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, yes, I have been waiting of number of months so there's high expectations that I'm going to deliver something exceptional today. I'm sorry if I'm going to disappoint you all.

I'm here to talk to you about what has been packaged as Project Ireland 2040 by the Government and this combines two documents, the National Planning Framework
and also the National Development Plan. The National Development Plan is really a spending plan so I'm going to just give you a little bit of information on that but I'm to focus on the area within my department which is the planning side, the National Planning Framework.

So the National Planning Framework has now been adopted, I suppose, by the Government. We don't need to critique it anymore because it is the policy. So what we want to do now is work within it, try and find the positives in it and get what we can out of it going forward for wicklow.

It's quite a long document. It covers lots and lots of areas. Just on the first slide there I'm just setting out for you the different chapters that the document deals with. It deals with a new way forward; regional Government; urban development; rural development; climate change and so on. All the things you'd expect it to address. I'm sure you've all read it at all, this stage, you've been waiting so long for this presentation and you know everything that's in it. You can take your time to read it now over the 20 years because it's a 20-year plan!

I'm just going to focus then on some of the areas that you did bring up when we discussed this previously when the plan was at draft stage and te11 you how those matters have been addressed in the final plan that's
been adopted. Those two areas are going to be population and rural housing.

So in terms of population growth. This National Planning Framework is a 20-year plan. It is actually a 15:32 22 -year plan up to 2040 and it's envisaging that the country will grow by up to a million people. The headline figures with regard to where that's going to happen in the Plan is $50 \%$ of all new population and employment will be in the five cities, which are as defined by the cso. In the Eastern and Midlands Region, which is where we are, the population target is 490,000 to 540,000 and the employment growth 320,000 . However, of that, Dublin City and suburbs is targeting 235,000 to 290,000 . So you see on the handout there and on the overhead, therefore, the remainder of the Midlands and Eastern Region, which is ourselves, Kildare, Laois, Longford, Meath, offaly and westmeath, the population target over the next 22 years is around 250,000.

Just to point out that Bray and Greystones are considered to be part of the Metropolitan Area of Dublin and the plan also does allow that up to $20 \%$ of the growth that has been targeted for the city and suburbs can occur in the wider Metropolitan Area. So we might get a little part of that 235 to 290,000 in the Bray and Greystones area as well. I'11 come to that later.

In terms of where the growth is going to occur then, how it's going to occur in towns. $40 \%$ of all new housing is to be in the built-up part of cities, towns and villages. The built-up would be as defined by the CSO. It's a little bit unclear exactly which definition they're going to use as built-up urban area. In some parts of the plan it talks about an urban area being any town bigger than 1500 , the CSO has a slightly different definition. So it's understood that all that will be ironed out in the region plan that's coming forward.

In terms of how much population growth we're going to be allowed have in the County. what the NPF allows for is that where you want to grow any settlement by more than $30 \%$ you have to fulfil certain criteria. You will recall that the draft NPF had set two growth targets; one was, that for towns over 15,000 they could grow by $25 \%$ and any under that would be allowed to grow by $15 \%$. When we ran those figures through and looked at our current figures it meant a considerable population reduction in Wicklow. We made a strong submission, yourselves and the Executive made a submission with concerns about that. So they've changed that now to if you want more than $30 \%$ you fulfil certain criteria, it's not just a blanket, that it applies for all towns over 15,000.

So those criteria are set out clearly in the NPF on the
next slide. They're more to do with whether the town is capable absorbing new growth. So the criteria are the extent to which a settlement is located inside or outside of the city region; the scale of employment and commuting in that town; the extent of local services and amenities (administration, education, health, 1eisure, retail); the extent of which trips may be made by sustainable modes of trave1; the rate and pace of development that we've experienced in the past and whether there is still catch-up to be done in terms of providing services; accessibility; particular sub-regional interdependencies; track record of performance and delivery, as well as ambition and initiative and scope to leverage; and commitment to achieve compact growth.

So they're all very sensible criteria. The question really is how will they all be measured? Essentially what it's coming down to is, we shouldn't be allowing significant new housing growth unless there's services, employment, sustainab1e transport and so on already available in the town or about to be provided.

We've been advised by the Department that the Regional Plan, which is to take this National Plan and bring it down to a Regional Plan will not be giving us prescriptive targets. So they will not be saying: 'Wicklow you can grow by X amount and Arklow, Greystones, Blessington has to grow by another
percentage'. What we've been told is we will be the ones to assess the capacity of our towns to absorb new growth. We have some concerns about that because we don't know how we's are supposed to assess that but we're assured by the Department that a methodology or a 15:36 toolkit will be provided that will be common across all County Councils so that we're all doing the same thing looking at the same data. So if we're assessing how strong a town is, say, in terms of employment provision there will be a particular set of data that everyone will use to do that assessment. That's to ensure that we're not competing with other counties for growth and to make sure everybody plays by the same rules.

That's still to come in the future. Some of the work I 15:37 think would be done in the Regional Plan, some of it would potentially come to us thereafter.

In terms of rural housing. You will recall that the draft NPF had proposed that there would be a strict requirement that anyone wanting to build a rural house anywhere that was in the shadow of the city or in the urban shadow would have to have a demonstrable economic need to build a rural house but they didn't include social need. The Minister has obviously listened to
your concerns in that regard and has included social need as a factor for rural housing in areas under urban influence. what needs to be defined is how much of the County is considered to be under urban influence.

Previous plans have said the whole county. More recent data analysis has suggested that potentially the southwest of the County might be considered outside of the influence of the big towns and of the city.

In terms of what happens in the areas outside of the urban influence, there will be no housing need criteria at a11. It will be house siting, design, you know, road safety and so on. I suppose the one concern that we would have about that is if the southwest of the County no longer has a social or economic need to live in a rural area there would be no impetus for anybody to build in a village or town in the southwest of the County if they can avail of a cheap site out in the countryside. So that's a bit of an anomaly we feel in this that there's a lot of talk about encouragement of villages and towns and making them stronger. If it becomes open season on rural housing then, you know, that contradicts that. But we'11 wait to see what the definition of the urban shadow is for the rest of the County.

I've included in the presentation there for you, to read in your own time, a number of the policies about rural development and rural housing. It's generally giving a very positive support for development in towns and villages for sustainable development. A fund of one billion has been earmarked to support rural development with particular focus on towns and villages
and making them more self-sustainable and improving quality of life in towns and villages. So that is perhaps to counteract the revised policy on rural housing.

Areas under urban influence. The Regional Authority have created this map, which was just in one of their issues paper. The grey area shows the area that they define to be under the influence of Dublin. So you can see the southwest of the County is falling outside of the urban influence. However, that data analysis didn't include the influence of Arklow and Carlow and other towns that are close to the southwest of the County. So it just looked at the influence of Dublin in that map. So that might changed so that's not fixed. So that will be done through the forthcoming Regional Plan.

Another major change that's set out in the NPF is provisions for zoning. This is going to affect how we do our Local Area Plans and all our Development Plans. The Department wants a much more -- well it's not the Department, it's State policy, wants a more systematic manner in which we decide what land to zone in Local Area Plans, with a particular focus on lands that are serviced and are going to be serviceable within the lifetime of that pl an and that every pl an is very clear on what services are needed to develop lands, how much those services are going to cost, who's going to be
paying for them and the phased manner in which they'11 be delivered. There's a clear objective here that if there's uncertainty about whether land will be zoned within the six-year life of that Local Area Plan it shouldn't be zoned. It's as simple as that. We don't zone and hope for the best. So that's going to take an extra bit, a good bit of extra work particularly, say, with regard to roads objectives where lots of our Local Area Plans have short, medium and long-roads objectives but they aren't necessarily designed and costed. A lot 15:41 of time the burden for delivering them sits with the developer because we're waiting for development to occur. We will now have to determine look, who's benefiting this from this road? Is it just the developer? Are they to bear the cost? or is the wider 15:41 public benefitting it? How should they share the burden of that cost and how it's going to be funded. so more precision in that regard.

The final area I just want to draw to your attention is there's a new type of plan that's going to be provided within the new Regional Plan that's forthcoming called a Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan and the Metropolitan Area, the parts of wicklow that are in the Metropolitan Area, like I said, are Bray and Greystones. This is going to be a sub-plan within the Regional Plan and there is potentially opportunities there, like I said, to avail of some extra population allocation that's been allocated to the Dublin area and potentially for
some investment possibilities there as well.

The only concern, I suppose, we'd have is the definition of where the Metropolitan Area starts and finishes.

Just moving quickly on, the next steps then. So there's a bill before the Oireachtas at the moment the Planning and Development (Amendment) Bill 2016 which will give effect to the NPF and will establish the Planning Regulator. The Planning Regulator is, I suppose, a Bord Pleanála for plans it's going to be. It's going to oversee the development plans that we adopt in the future to make sure that they comply with the NPF and with any Government policies or any regional plans. We understand that an amendment has been put forward to this bill which like I said hasn't passed yet through the Oireachtas, which is going to change temporarily the timeline for review of County Development Plans. And by that I mean that any county that's in the middle of doing a County Development Plan at the moment, it will put the brakes on it and halt the process until the new Regional Plan is adopted. And thereafter, that should be around December or January, they can reinitiate the process of adopting the Development Plan. This is to avoid a situation where some counties might in that they'd adopt a County Development Plan this year and within a few months they've a new National Planning Framework and a new

Regional Plan which might set different criteria for them.

It doesn't affect us so much because our Development Plan was adopted in 2016, but I understand that this amendment is going to require all local authorities to review their existing County Development Plan within 26 weeks of the new Regional plan being adopted. So that means that potentially in January next year we're going to have start a process of reviewing our entire County Development Plan, looking at all our population targets, looking at all our zoning, essentially doing our core strategy all over again. That obviously is going to have very significant implications for the whole county but we don't really know what our populated targets would be and what the changes will be until the Regional Plan is done.

We do have some concerns in this regard that if we commence some Local Area Plans this year and, say, we move along with them over the next few months and adopt them towards the end of the year, within a few months we'11 have to revisit them. This is an issue that we brought up at today's SPC and we might schedule it for the next SPC again to look at our programme for Local Area Plans and which ones we do this year, which ones we maybe leave till next year until we have a bit more clarity.

So like I said, the new Regional Plan hopefully is towards the end of this year or early next year and then after that a variation of the County Development Plan will follow.

Just moving quickly on to the National Development Plan. The National Development Plan is the money part of this plan and the aim of this is to set out the investment priorities that would underpin the successful implementation of the NPF. An essential part of this, it announces four new funds and these are funds that we can avail of. They would put out a call for projects and we will submit projects to try and avail of these funds. There will be an urban development fund of a billion; a rural fund of a billion; 500 million for climate change; and I can't remember what the last one is, sorry, I'11 come to it now.

Essentially over the next -- this isn't going to happen straightaway, but it will happen over the next ten years, that the Government will put out a call for projects, whether that be climate change-related projects or rural development, it could be urban rail projects, it could be employment-related, it could be community development-related and when the call goes out for projects we need to be ready with our projects to submit them for funding.

The projects have to underpin the principles of the NPF. I suppose there's a stick and carrot approach. The stick is the Planning Regulator who will make sure that we comply with the NPF and the carrot is to dangle that money in front of us to show how we're going to bring about projects that will comply with the NPF.

The National Development Plan also does, however, list some specific projects that it is funding. So I will just draw to your attention there on the last two pages of the presentation, anywhere that Wicklow, or anywhere in wicklow is mentioned in that. It's not mentioned that often, I suppose, as you might expect, and some of the projects that appear to be listed appear to be things that we already have, interestingly. But it mentions a Park-and-Ride Programme for Greystones ; the Luas expansion to Bray; DART improvement; the Vartry water Supply Scheme; refurbished courthouse in wicklow and in Bray; and heritage, more investment in the Wicklow Mountains/National Park. But like I said, just 15:46 because something isn't listed in that we shouldn't get depressed because there's this other fund of 4 billion that's out there that there would be numerous opportunities for us to avail of and bid for that money going forward.

So that's essentially the key aspects of the NPF. Like I said, there's lots more in it but I just focused on areas that you brought up at previous meetings. If
anyone wants to discuss it further or, you know, we can bring it back to the SPC or we can bring it Municipal Districts if there's any particular aspect of it you want us to come and talk to you about.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. C11r. Mitchell.
CLLR. MITCHELL: Thank you for your presentation, it was interesting. I suppose it's a little uncertain how the National Planning Framework is actually going to affect us in terms of actual numbers. I would welcome one part of it in particular and that is the linking of 15:47 the growth to the provision of infrastructure and, also, jobs. Certainly at the moment, for instance, in Greystones there's probably in the region of 600 houses being built at the moment and the roads which were planned 30 years ago are nowhere near completion and are many years away, even with the best will in the world and the most money. So there's certainly very much a need to link the growth and that has not been the case in the past, particularly for roads. To an extent I think the schools have followed, reasonably, not always as quick as one might have liked but they have followed the growth but the roads have not. The other thing that hasn't been provided or hasn't happened is jobs and Greystones has a low job ratio of people working within the town, in spite of quite large 15:48 areas of land being zoned for industry. So I welcome the fact that's linked to the decision to grow a town as to whether there has been an industry or not.

I would just like to say a couple of things about the national investment in transport and things. It does contain details about the work on the N11 which initially would be a small amount but they're working on that plan to improve it around Bray. This plan will cost in the region of $1-$ to 200 million and it will be extremely expensive and is absolutely essential that this goes ahead, otherwise the County will seize up, the east of the County it seize up.

There is one other aspect of the list, though, that we have a railway in wicklow which goes south of Greystones from Kilcoole down to wexford and it's hardly used. We have massive traffic jams on the N11, yet we hardly use the rail line and that's because a terrible service is provided on it. If you, for instance, contrast that with Carlow, four times as many people use the train in Carlow, as they do in wicklow Town, even though it goes to the western station in Dublin Heuston which there aren't as many jobs at as there are along the Wicklow rail line. So clearly there's a need to provide more service on this rail line. Unfortunately the long-term plan is not very good in the National Development Plan. It is to provide a shuttle to make everybody from Kilcoole and south of it transfer train in Greystones and in my view provide a worse service. A shuttle was tried before and it failed miserably and people stopped using it.

I think we need to agitate quite strongly in Wicklow to have a proper rail service provided. The line is there, it's expensive to maintain and should be used.

Now what's not mentioned in Sorcha's presentation is, 15:51 there is a section in the National Development Plan where 28 carriages are due in service, refurbished ones in 2019 and it's essential that we lobby to get these used to provide an extra train from and to Gorey. There are two slots around Bray Head at rush hour which 15:51 are available and we need to make certain that eight carriages out of that lot are allocated to this rail line here and take these cars off the N11, which is obviously what we should be doing. Even with the best will in the world and if somebody lands 100 million into the Council tomorrow, it will take five years at least to do the N11 work. So it's urgent that this extra train is provided.

So I have a proposal here which I'd like the Council to $15: 51$ agree. That the Council lobbies the Transport Authority to ensure that eight of the carriages resulting from the refurbishment 28 carriages due in 2019 are used to provide an extra train from and to Gorey using either of the two slots available around Bray Head. We should also get together with Wexford County Council to lobby for this. I have produced a rail plan which has been submitted to the rail authorities who thanked me for my interest in it and
didn't want to speak about it and the national transport people who may well speak. But I think it's important that we lobby this and I have a particular suggestion and proposal here which I'd like to hand up. Thanks.

CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, and thanks for the presentation, Sorcha, it was worth waiting for. In terms of that funding, that $€ 3$ billion funding that's available for certain types of projects, I think it's
really important that the districts get going on that straightaway. with regards to that, would it be of value for the District Engineers or District Managers maybe to get together to be briefed on the criteria of what project would qualify for that funding because we were really left out, wicklow was really, really left out in the infrastructure fund that associated this National Planning Framework. I know you did your best to highlight places in wicklow that seem to have benefitted from it, but that's very little in terms of infrastructural investment. Some of it was just an increase in routes and frequencies but very, very little -- I mean the Luas not coming to Bray and DART underground be shelved are probably two of the biggest public transport necessities that would have served Bray and probably the Greater North Wicklow area. So I think we were really left out in wicklow in terms of that and it's disappointing. So I think we should be ready to go as a district or as all the districts to try and avail of that $€ 3$ billion fund. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks. C11r. Blake.
CLLR. BLAKE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, and thanks, Sorcha, for the presentation. I certainly do support Derek's concern. He has been advocating on behalf of Greystones and Bray for a lot of years in terms of improvement to rail services in that particular area.

Unlike Derek, we have very much a rural area that we
look after in South and west wicklow. In that regard we have had a number of meetings with Irish water over the last couple of years and we've been emphasising to them the need for water and sewerage in some of our smaller towns and villages. That's what we're talking about developing Cork or Limerick or wherever else is double the population. Realistically in the smaller towns and villages what we're looking for is a decent supply of water and a sewerage system. I think that's what we should be emphasising to the Department in terms of whatever funding is to be available and it has been mentioned here about the Districts being informed about it as well. I think in the Baltinglass District I think it's important that we would emphasise the fact that whatever money is to be spent in the rural areas that water and sewerage is the main thing that we should actually be looking after in that regard. As I said, in a number of meetings we've had in the last couple of years with Irish Water, trying to move those on and very little progress has been made in that regard. The CEO probably understands very wel1, coming to meetings over the last number of years, that we are in very much a rural part as well, very much like an awful lot of County Leitrim in that regard.

The final point I would make is in regards to the pressure that wicklow is under in terms of urban influence in Dublin. I see from the map anyway that parts of South Wicklow and Southwest Wicklow is not
included in that map. So I can take it from your direction, Sorcha, that you probably have a different ruling in regulation terms of planning in that part of wicklow, particularly in regard to maybe one-off rural houses? Thanks very much.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. McLough1in.
CLLR. McLOUGHLIN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Thanks, Sorcha, for your presentation. I suppose really what I'm most worried about is going back to the Board with regards to the County Development Plan and if that's starting, say, if we do that early next year and in Greystones we should be technically starting on a review of the next Local Development Plan. And Greystones has a big impact on everything that's in this. I'm just wondering where do you think we can start or is it a waste of time even starting because everything depends on what's going to happen at the end of the day. We're looking at Arklow and even if you look at the Arklow situation where the Minister has decided that they shouldn't have a hote1 and yet one of 15:57 the criteria is that we have to look at the leisure facilities. So I'm just thinking we are doing Local Area Plans and we have implemented Local Area Plans but actually can we go ahead and do any of it without actually having knowledge or a base of the actual strategy that's evolved because it's almost a waste of time if we have to go back to the drawing board and review it all over again. I think it's sort of a catch-22 we're in or maybe am $I$ wrong in that? And the
other thing I'd like to ask, will this effectively mean that we will be de-zoning land in some towns because that's what I'm getting from it. Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. o'brien.
CLLR. O'bRIEN: Thanks again, Sorcha, for the presentation. The only two worries I have about this is centralisation. I think Cl1r. McLoughlin spoke there a minute ago about what the minister said about a hotel being built. I somewhat get the feeling from this, you said there, Sorcha, we are going to be allowed, when you were talking about population growth, that if some centralised controlling body is going to tell us how much we can grow by. That's a very, very serious worry it this plan could become very stagnant if you take out the local input and the local spirit that's in it.

The second thing I'd like to question is whether this $€ 4$ billion fund that was mentioned there again, this obviously has to come from somewhere. I'm wondering is it going to come from the taxpayer as per usual and what exactly is this one you're talking about and this new mechanism that you're talking about. I'm just wondering what this new mechanism is.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhill.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. Cathaoirleach, first of all, I'd like to say to Sorcha thanks very much, very interesting presentation. I was in Donegal last weekend and this was up for mention and
listening to some of the people that were there, you know, they were talking about it, you know, and this is really, this framework is very detailed. I was speaking to some of the delegates that were there and some were saying, well, there's an awful lot of detail there, you know, like but I know one member that was there actually a retired garda from that point of view and he said, well if you look at this document there's 177 pages and he said if you look at it there's only seven pages in relation to housing. And some people will say, you know, instead of trying to get everything right we should be getting it bit by bit by bit, housing and also a personal that agreed with me there was Cllr. Dermot Lacey. But looking at this now, one thing I've just picked out, and it's very interesting and it runs parallel with our situation in Bray at the moment, the demolition of St. Paul's. You have an item there "Park-and-Ride Programme: Strategic park-and-ride sites plus investment in parking facilities at Bray, Luas and bus locations." So I mean 16:00 like all I can only say is from what I can see at the moment with wicklow County Council and what's happening on the Herbert Road it's not running in parallel with the future thought process of the National Framework. I think it's something that we should look at because we're trying to get people to, you know, like, to not be bringing in cars and cars into the centre but maybe as you've just stated here, Park-and-Ride Programmes. Go raibh maith agat.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, do you want to come back in? MS. WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I think there was only a few questions really raised there. I suppose one, C11r. Blake, you asked would there be a different sort of planning regime? Is he there? He's gone. He asked would there be a different planning regime in the southwest of the County in terms of rural housing. I suppose what we're saying is we don't know yet because we don't know -- this map of the urban influence of the city shows the southwest of the County 16:01 not being in the urban influence but it hasn't factored in the urban influence of the big towns surrounding it. I understand that towns over 10,000 in size will be factored in. So the southwest of the County might end up all being considered in the shadow of an urban area. So we won't know that yet until the Regional Authority, in their work on the Regional Plan, does all their data analysis. We'11 come back to you as soon as we get some clarity on that.

There's an EU template of how you determine whether an area is in the sphere of influence of a town.
Essentially I think it's that if more than $15 \%$ of the workforce in that area work in the town then you're under the urban influence of that town. You probably do it by electoral division or something like that, a defined geographical. Fifteen percent is very low. You would imagine that at least 15\%, probably considerably more, of all the people living down the
southwest of wicklow are travelling into a town of more than 10,000 in size for their employment. So that's why I just put out there that that map isn't final and we might find that the entirety of our County stays in the current policy regime it's in, which is that you had to have a social or economical need to build in a rural area. So there would be no effective change from where we are now.

Turning to C11r. McLough1in's question about would it be a waste of time to start the next batch of Local Area Plans? That would certain7y be one of our concerns. I might be doing myself out of a job here but, you know, I think particularly, the public are getting very engaged again. Or in some places they seem to be getting engaged again in Development Plans. For example, we've started the process of doing a new plan for Newtownmountkennedy and there's numerous community groups that have been established with very good attendance at our public meetings and the public have really bought in to getting a new plan for their town. I don't know how they would feel if we have to return to them a few months after they've adopted the Plan and say: 'That plan you just did, by the way, that's going to in the bin. We've do a new one.' I think they'd disengage with us and they'd be very disillusioned. Obvious7y it also it affects landowners who may be in line to get their land zone, if in one plan they're getting zoned and then six months later
they're de-zoned, you know. It's something we're going to have to think hard about and I suppose we'll learn more over the next few months in our interactions with the Department and with the Regional Assembly and how the Regional Plan is rolling out over the next few months. We did flag to the Department, you know, that it was maybe an omission on their part to not include putting the foot on the brake on Local Area Plans as well as County Development Plans. They didn't seem too concerned, they were more concerned with the County Development Plan process. We might re-emphasise that with them. As I said, that bill hasn't passed through the Oireachtas yet. I don't know, it could be amended further. But the same thing has happened to every county around the country so we'11 know more as time goes on. But the three plans that are 2013-2019 plans which are wicklow Town \& Rathnew, Greystones and Blessington. So technically we don't have to start the review of those plans until next year. Now usually we try to go a little bit ahead, maybe get six months ahead so we can get all the work done and the preliminary stuff done. So we have a bit of time that we could put them on hold. On the other hand, if you're very keen to keep going with Local Area Plans, we just have to make it very clear that there's potentially changes coming down the road.

An example is Newtownmountkennedy where we're going to continue with the plan because effectively all the land
that we would be zoning has planning permission. So even if that land got dezoned next year, it has planning permission. So that's perhaps a unique situation in that it wouldn't change the status quo much, but there might be much more significant changes in somewhere bigger like Wicklow or Greystones. So we'11 have to just watch that one and see how that pans out.

Cllr. O'Brien's point about everything being centralised. Yeah, it's been like that for quite a while now. We've had our population targets just handed to us on a platter and we have to comply with them. It's getting tighter and tighter as time goes on. The new Planning Regulator will keep a much closer plan on development plans. A number of you mentioned, through the course of the meeting today, the Minister getting involved in Local Area Plans when we were discussing Arklow and you will notice that the Minister has been issuing more and more Ministerial Directions in the last two to three years particularly than he ever did before, across the country. I would hazard a guess that they're sort of pepping us for the Planning Regulator that's going to be involved in all our Local Area Plans, that there's going to be this overseer who is going to look at all of our plans. As C11r. Behan mentioned, local democracy perhaps being eroded. This is the way it's moving, that we can have more and more oversight of our Local Area Plans to ensure that they
comply with the National Planning Framework and with the Regional Plan.

Now we in Wicklow, we've always been very good at complying with plans. We haven't had reckless amounts of zoning, other counties haven't been the same. And perhaps it's other counties' behaviour that have led to this. I hope it's other counties' behaviour rather than our own that has led to this but it's coming, the Planning Regulator is coming so we need to be prepared for a higher body intervening with our Local Area Plans if they're not satisfied that we're rezoning the right amount of land, or our objectives aren't strong enough.

The € 4 billion. Well where does the State get its money from? Taxation presumably. I suppose one of the concerns is that this isn't a new €4 billion, it's just a repackaged €4 billion, that it's the money that was going to be invested in Irish water and NTA projects anyway, or TII. So I can't answer that but I do believe we really need to be ready, as C11r. Matthews says, with our projects. No matter what type of projects they are we need to be sitting up carefully and looking at what each town, village and area needs and then when funding gets announced for whatever form of projects that they're looking for, we're ready with a number of different forms of projects to submit and have the consents in place, or whatever it might be.

I think that's going to be a new way of doing things over the next few years and it's going to be challenging but exciting at the same time that there's going to be numerous sources of funding apparently going to be announced over the years. So every few months or a few times a year we're going to get a big announcement, get your projects in and we can step up try and get that money. I think that's most of the questions.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Fortune, you want to come in. CLLR. FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks, Sorcha, for your presentation. It's all very interesting. When we talk about Bray and Greystones, are we talking about the towns of Bray and Greystones or the Council Districts of Bray and Greystones? Because we have a district entity here rather than just a town. I'd be interested in that. Your comment also on $15 \%$ of where people work, you know, take Kilcoole as an example, there's more industry in Kilcoole, after Bray, than anywhere else in the County at the moment. So I would be interested to see how that all fits in.
while this is a very impressive document and it's a great plan, I've read a fair bit from various sources and there is a view that it's a wish-list if you know probably a regurgitation of a lot of programmes that have been kicked around for a number of years and throw it out to 2040, I mean there's a lot of change going to
happen in the short and medium term before we even get near that. There would appear to be a view that this is a plan maybe without substance even though it's listed down the way it is. So I'd be interested in your comments on that. I'd be interested in the way the map for the Metropolitan Area and what that actually means.

I'd be particularly interested, obviously, in where $I$ live myself because it's a town or village of 4,000 people and it will grow to 5,000 people and in the immediate future there's going to be about 300 new houses new houses built in it. So my concern would be that if this went a certain way that you're kind of, it reminds me of a meeting I attended when I was involved in tourism and I expressed the view that we were being treated in wicklow as if we were on the window ledge, looking in through the window and not being allowed play the game. That's the kind of concern I would have when I look at this map here and I look at the area I live in and represent is developing. So, again, having asked you all that I don't expect you to have exact answers because I do think this overall plan, to a certain extent at this moment in time, is a bit of a wish-list.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Thornhill, you wanted to come back in.

CLLR. THORNHILL: Sorcha, now I didn't ask you the question but maybe I should have had. I mentioned
about Park-and-Ride Programmes. Maybe you just might mention your thoughts on the Park-and-Ride Programmes for the future in relation to what $I$ have just mentioned. You mentioned here: "Park-and-Ride Programmes: Strategic park-and-ride sites." It's just 16:11 something for the future, you know, maybe.
MS. WALSH: I don't have any particular opinion to offer to the meeting on the park-and-rides. All I was stating for you was in the National Development Plan one of the categories of funding they have listed is park-and-ride facilities and they've mentioned Greystones. Park-and-ride facilities, where they're going to be located and how they're going to be funded are more dealt with under the NTA Strategy, which is the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, which was adopted two years ago. So I can certainly get you that document that outlines the position of the NTA with regard to park-and-ride locations.

There's also a study being done by the NTA at the moment on Bray and Bray Environs and they'11 also be dealing with park-and-ride in the Bray area in that study. So when that's finalised we will make that available to you.

In terms of cllr. Fortune's questions. The location -the boundary of the Metropolitan Area is actually an interesting one and we have actually engaged with the Regional Authority on this and it actually is in our
submission to the Draft Regional Plan. So I did circulate that at the time. I'm sure nobody read it so I'11 circulate it again. Essentially going back to 1999 when we did our first Regional Plan, which was, I'm sure you'11 remember the SPGs, the Strategic Plans and Guidelines. It defined a Metropolitan Area that included Bray and Greystones but it showed it just on a graphic, not on a precise map and it was very hard to work out where the boundaries of it were. That map has been carried forward over the years and it hasn't really been approved, it's just a drawing rather than a clear map.

The NTA, when they were doing their transport strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, they said: 'we're going to take the definition of the Greater Dublin Areas', that which is defined in the Regional Plan. But they wanted to be more precise so they used the boundary of particular electoral divisions. So it didn't quite match what was in the Regional Plan. But now the Regional Authority are saying, well, we're going to use what's in the NTA study as the boundary of the Metropolitan Area. So we pointed out this anomaly to them saying who decides this? Surely it should be the Regional Plan that decides this and the NTA then follows.

We also pointed out, for example, that the boundary would appear to end at the Greystones ED Southern

Boundary which doesn't include Charlesland because Charlesland's in the kilcoole ED. So essentially if they use the boundary that they have at the moment, a good chunk of Greystones isn't technically in the Metropolitan Area. We've been advised by the regional team that they will look at all of these issues and hopefully we'11 have a nice clean boundary that makes sense.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. o'brien.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: It mentions a lot about population growth in the plan, you know, and I have to be a small bit cynical and say they can't cater for the people they already have. Surely that should be our first plan to sort out the problems that are there and then you have a (inaudible). As I said, I'm very cynical
about it and I think it's a lot of wasted money and stuff. I would be (inaudible). I would have far more belief in the plans if that was the case. They are the plans -- I know it's coming from the Government, it's nothing to do with your guys but it just seems to me you have to be very, very cynical about a plan like that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks. Thanks, Members. Item 8: To note the Annual Service Delivery Plan 2018.
MR. CURRAN: Cathaoirleach, that's the plan that's really setting out the main services that will be provided by wicklow County Council to the public during 2019. It's aligned with the objectives of the corporate Plan (inaudible) and the management funds.

So it goes through it section by section. It starts with housing in terms of what's going to be supplied under Local Authority Housing Part 5 housing applications.

Moving on to roads, in terms of the amount of roadway to be serviced, et cetera. I don't intend to go through it line-by-1ine. I'11 take it as read if people have any questions that have to be taken. CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Matthews.

CLLR. MATTHEWS: Cathaoirleach, I just have a question on the Road Section, the Environment Section and the Planning Section simple enough questions. I just note on the Roads section the number of safety measures at schools for 2017 is six but for 2018 it's three. Is there a reason that it comes down or is this done over a three-year period? It's a question for Roads.

On Environment, monitoring of historical landfills. I'm just wondering is the Bray, Dun Laoghaire landfill included in that? And are we still on target for the works to remediate that landfill? About environmental quality. Just a question on air quality, monitoring. I know it's an EPA function but it's an EPA monitoring station in Bray which is on Local Authority land and I wonder can we approach the EPA to look to have that monitoring station upgraded and to expand what it's able to monitor at the moment? Because the air quality in Bray hasn't got very good records recently. So I'd
like to see us improving that.

Then on planning, there's an increase -- there's a marked increase each year in the number of applications and the number of enforcement places taken. So I'm just wondering are the planning, is planning services sufficiently resourced in terms of staff to look at that increase that we're going to see in planning as we go forward, if we are going to go see it? And also on the collection of development contributions, the amount 16:17 outstanding, are we sufficiently resourced in planning to pursue people for development contributions and is that kind of normal the amount that we collected as regards the amount that's outstanding? Thanks, Cathaoirleach.
CATHAOIRLEACH: okay.
MR. CURRAN: I might ask the Director just to reply to those in terms of road.

I will just deal myself with it first. In terms of the 16:17 development contributions, we are putting more resources into that area and we need to do better in that. No question.

The number of staff in the Planning section. We have replaced a few recently and we look that usually at the start of the year when we're doing the budget. I think we're okay in terms of numbers of planners, et cetera but we'll keep an eye on it as applications increase.

If they increase more than we thought then we'11 have to change what we're doing there.

Environmental quality, certainly we can talk to the EPA in terms of upgrading that. I haven't seen it now but we'11 certainly raise it with them.

Monitoring of the landfills, in particular the Bray and Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown. I might ask Michael to do that I suspect it's Dun Laoghaire but I'11 get
clarification.
MR. GEANEY: The landfill at Bray North, that's primarily a matter for Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown. Now we have had meetings in recent times on this and progress is being made. A consultant is about to be appointed if a consultant hasn't been appointed. So progress is being made. There is regular contact the wicklow County Council and Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown.
MR. CURRAN: Thanks, Michael. Just on the safety measures. It's a function of the funding we receive, but Sean might just want to clarify there on the roads and the school safety.
MR. QUIRKE: That's an additional € $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{million} . ~ S o}$ we have safety measures at a lot of schools at this stage. you'11 notice the flashing lights and so on. And the number of schools is going to increase hugely so that's why I put it in for this year. That is a matter for funding (inaudible).
CLLR. MATTHEWS: Sorry, I didn't realise it was an
additional three.
MR. QUIRKE: We're not reducing it.
CLLR. MATTHEWS: A11 right. okay. Thanks.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 9: To consider and adopt the LCDC
Annual Report.
MS. GALLAGHER: Members have been circulated with the report.
MR. CURRAN: That's been circulated.
CLLR. McLOUGHLIN: Cathaoirleach, just before it's implemented can I -- I'm not sure if Michael is going up to say a few words about it, is he?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah.
MR. NICHOLSON: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Another successful year of the LCDC, which is working extremely well in wicklow. Just to recap for the Members who may 16:20 not be a hundred percent familiar with what the LCDC does. It's a 19-strong Committee. I suppose the hint is in the title: Local Community Development Committees so it's to primarily deal with community at a local level.

We have four main functions. One is overseen the SICAP Programme. This is being delivered by two partnerships the Bray Area Partnership for the Bray and Greystones area and the County Wicklow Partnership which is the rest of the County. A five-year programme 2018-2022. The old programme finished last year. It's worth about €6 million to the County in total. It's a very, very good project, delivering loads of small projects
locally, reaching out to those hard to reach communities.
we also oversee the LEADER Programme and in fact that the LCDC acting as the Local Action Group actually finally approve all LEADER projects. Again it's $€ 5$ million up to 2020. Projects are now starting to roll out. We expect to be approved for about $€ 2$ million this year and the balance next year and the year after. We've had a series of information meetings to promote LEADER applications. We've had a lot of meetings in January and February and a load of projects came from those meetings that have been passed on through LEADER. That's being run by the County wicklow Partnership on our behalf.

The Local Economic and Community Plan. Members will be aware that there was community actions and economic actions and we have meetings on a regular basis. Our plan is progressing very nicely. Most of the actions are being carried out and there's great progress being done on that. Also, we have control over the PPN. It's great to see the PPN being used now for practically every item of consultation that goes on from this Council. Is uses the PPN structure (inaudible) sent to the PPN coordinator, they hit literally thousands of people.

So that's the summary. I'd recommend the report for
approval.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Matthews.
CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just looking at the table at the bottom of that report. The funding stream, it's about 1.2 million. It seems like only
10,000 of that -- 10,000 of that went to Greystones -CATHAOIRLEACH: Could you talk into your mic.
CLLR. MATTHEWS: Sorry. About 10,000 of that went towards the Greystones or kilcoole (inaudible) there but that's the only figure that seemed to come to the North of the County. I'm just wondering are we not applying from the north of the County for these projects or are our applications not being -- or our applications, do they need a bit of work? There's 380,000 per town and village renewal funding and in 2016 and 2017 none of that came to the Bray District. So the likes of kilmacanogue or Enniskerry. Then it gave the recreation fund 176,000 and none of that seemed to come to Bray or Greystones at all. Then the various schemes 335,000 and -- so out of the 1.2 only
10,000 came to the north of the County. Is that anything to do -- should we have more representation from the North of the County? Should we be putting in more applications? or is it that our applications are going in but they're failing at application stage?
Thanks, Cathaoirleach.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. McLoughlin.
CLLR. McLoughlin: Thank you. I would like to see the implementation of this plan or approval of it.

There's been a huge amount of work done within the LCDC and I suppose huge thanks must given to the staff of wicklow County Council for implementing what is a huge programme. People don't understand, when they see the word community they automatically think that's the easy bit of running the Council and everything else is a lot more difficult. I would say, C11r. Matthews, the SICAP Programme is North wicklow, that's $100 \%$ to be delivered from Bray and the majority of the projects are Bray. The (inaudible) Programme was delivered into Bray so you probably are looking at one individual case as opposed to, there's an awful lot that has gone to the bray. There is an awful lot too that goes into rural development because the word in itself means it's outside the Bray area. There is definitely an issue with regard to Greystones and Bray with the amount of applications that people make or do not make in this case and probably would not be included. I would say and I have to say, as chair of the LCDC I have to thank all the different agencies from the SICAP Programme, the LEADER Programme, (inaudible) all different groups in each of the towns and villages, particularly the Committee who work alongside me. It is not easy, it is not -- for those on the Council who are Members of the LCDC they know all too well the amount of work that's involved. I would like to thank the management and staff of wicklow County Council for their help and support in us doing our job in the LCDC because it is a formidable amount of work. Thank you.

CLLR. MATTHEWS: Sorry, Cathaoirleach, could I just come back in there. I just had this 24-page report which just referred to that funding and I see LEADER and SICAP reports are separate. Maybe I got them but I didn't open them. Did we get sent those as well? MR. NICHOLSON: You did, yeah. Actually, Cathaoirleach, $I$ can answer some of the questions that c11r. Matthews asked. The page that you're referring to is 106 on your agenda which lists all the grants that were approved last year. The good news is that that money is available every year, it's not a once-off. But unfortunately the Town and Village Renewal Scheme didn't really apply to Bray because there's population categories and Bray didn't qualify. (Inaudible) so a lot of the funding you see there Bray just doesn't qualify and neither does Greystones. But as C11r. McLough1in says all of the SICAP is all in Bray and LEADER also applies to Bray. So the good news is the money is available every year. So certainly by a11 means send in applications. We haven't got the population criteria yet but if Bray does qualify it certainly would be included but it has to qualify. CLLR. MATTHEWS: Enniskerry and Kilmac would apply? MR. NICHOLSON: Yeah. We did send in some projects for Enniskerry but they weren't approved.
MR. CURRAN: Once the public meetings took place in relation to the type of funding that's available and a lot of them has come through already even though the schemes haven't opened.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I need a proposer and a seconder. CLLR. McLOUGHLIN: I would like to propose that. CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, C11r. Kennedy, you wanted to -CLLR. KENNEDY: I would like to second Cl1r. McLoughlin's proposal for the adoption of that 16:27 plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is that agreed?
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Members. Item 10: To note the NOAC report on performance indicators (e-mail link previously circulated). Any comments on that? MR. MURPHY: Cathaoirleach, the Members have previously been circulated with a link to the NOAC performance indicator report for the year 2016. The Members have also been circulated with the detailed tables in respect of each of the performances. The tables run into 27, the overal1 report runs to approximately 100 pages. The corporate plan, as Members will be aware, sets out the high level goals for the Council's activities and it provides a context and a framework for the Council's Annual Service Delivery Plan which we just dealt with.

Performance indicators are used to help us to monitor and measure the services that we provide. The National 16:28 Oversight and Audit Commission (or NOAC for short), which was established by the Government under the Local Government Reform Act 2014 is charged with scrutinising the performance of local authorities across the various
indicators. This is the third report published by NOAC. There are 32 indicators covered. The indicators cover a wide range of functions carried out by local authorities including, housing, roads, planning, water, waste water, environment, fire services, library, recreation, youth, community, corporate, finance and economic development. The results for each of the performance indicators are provided for in a series of tables which I have just referred to, 27 in all.

The process delivers useful comparative information for local authorities and is being built on and will be further built on over time. Wicklow has performed reasonably well across the 32 indicators. NOAC in the most recent report encouraged all local authorities to use comparators of performance when and where appropriate to see what we can do better, to learn from what one another and to improve our performance and to engage with Audit Committees, to engage with the Elected Members and also the relevant staff throughout the (inaudible). The Management Team has considered this report and it's due to be listed on the agenda for the next Audit Committee meeting. The report also was listed this morning on the Corporate policy Group agenda. The Annual Service Delivery Plan covers a lot of those performance indicators in that it dealt with data, including out-turns and targets for 2018. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Any comments? okay, I'11 take that as
read.

Item 11: To discuss the recent sale of Ardmore Studios, Bray, County Wicklow.
CLLR. BEHAN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks, for agreeing to my request to put this on the agenda. I think it's important that we discuss the implications of the sale of Ardmore Studios for the County and for the future of the studios in Bray.

As Members may be aware, the studios have been bought by some of shareholders in Troy Studios in Limerick and the CEO in Bray will continue, but she also has an involvement or is CEO in Troy Studios as well.

On the face of it, it looks encouraging that the new owners are committed to retaining the studios in Bray and in this County for use for filmmaking into the future. That obviously is of huge importance to people who work in the film industry in Bray and in the wider area. However, I am concerned about a couple of aspects and I just want to put them on the record.

First of all, the Government have sold their remaining stake in the studios to this particular group of buyers. Media speculation has also said that the Government has written off some debts that were owed to the State as part of this deal and it's not really very clear like what the actual settlement was for the
taxpayer in this deal, but it certainly looks like it has been a very generous deal to the buyers. But it also strategically means that the State is completely moving out of the support of what was the National film Studios and I don't welcome that. I don't think that's a positive development at all. But I know from recent speculation that the Minister who was in charge, at the time, promised oireachtas members that they would be told or given information on this before the State ever sold its stake. And from what I can understand from media reports, that didn't happen. And I think we should write to the Department of Enterprise and look for clarification on what actually happened? what amount of money was received by the taxpayer for the sale of the State's stake in the studios? And why they sold it? That's the point number one.

The second point is that in today's Irish Times there's an article and just the headline is:
"Ardmore and Troy Studios planning joint strategy."

What the article is really saying is that the CEO of both studios is saying they're going to kind of come together and have a -- they'11 be separate entities but 18:34 they may be marketing themselves jointly and they'11 be offering the totality of their facilities to possible filmmakers and so on out there internationally. Again, that looks good. Sounds great. But my concern is
this: At some point in time are we going to get a request from these new owners that well, you know, we have a lot of capacity down in Limerick, we could really attract really big budget movies to this country, including part of Bray but we're going to have 16:35 to sell off some of Bray to realise the money that we're going to need to really upgrade this new joint entity. Now I'm emphasise Siún Ní Raghallaigh in the paper today is saying they're still standalone entities but I'm concerned that bit by bit we're suddenly going to be part of the Troy Studios and later on down the line maybe part of Ardmore is going to be lost to the Town of Bray and to the County. I want to be absolutely clear, publicly, and I think this Council should be absolutely clear publicly that we are never going to agree to a change of zoning on any of that film studio site in Bray. We put a very, very strong provision in our Local Area Plan which has been in Bray Urban District Council Plan for many years, that that site is only for filmmaking and will not and will never 18:35 be considered to be rezoned for residential development as a way of some future owner cashing in on the property value on that site. I just want to put on record my concern about how this is moving. I hope I'm wrong and I do think it would be worthwhile to invite the new owners of Ardmore Studios to a future meeting of this Council to lay out in full and clear details what their plans are for Ardmore Studios and to answer any questions that we might want to put to them. I
want to propose that we issue that today. Thank you. CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you have a seconder?
CLLR. LAWLESS: I'11 second that.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Lawless.
CLLR. LAWLESS: I echo everything that c11r. Behan has said. You know, talking to the employees up in Ardmore and everything seems reasonable and people seem happy enough and it's great to see that it's being kept as a film studio at the moment. But I mean it is extremely disappointing that the State has actually sold their shares off. I mean at the moment, yes, it's a film studio but like what Cl1r. Behan said, we don't know what's going to come down the road. They might want to change it, sell it off and the State has actually sold our security away by selling those shares. I mean they were supposed to come back to us, they were supposed to inform us, let us the know benefits and nothing. Absolutely nothing. I would agree with cllr. Behan that we should actually have the new company come in and kind of set out what their plans are for the film industry here in wicklow.

And also, I don't know whether people are aware or not or I don't know how true this is but it isn't Troy Studios in full that has actually bought this, it's my
belief - and I could be corrected - it's only one director that's involved in buying this as well. My overall feeling, it's a huge let down on behalf of the Government and the then minister at the time that they
went and sold these shares without actually informing us here in wicklow, which they had promised to do. As I say, it's taken security away from us here as Councillors as well. Thanks. CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Matthews.

CLLR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. The Bray Councillors gave a very firm commitment last year or the year before about retaining the zoning on that land for film industry only and we've done that in our Local Area Plan. In fact there's been extra land zoned for film industry in Bray. So I think that demonstrates that as Councillors we're firmly committed that that land is suitable for the film industry and we'11 continue to support that. But you have to be aware that this land is now privately owned. We know longer have the IDA or the Department, we met the minister last, about 18 months ago, so they no longer have a hold on this. So it's private land. And at the moment, and we discussed it briefly earlier on about the democratic process in the planning system and how it seems to be getting slightly undermined but at the moment now if you go for a large project of 100 plus houses, you can go direct to the Board with it and the Board can overturn the Local Area Plan. So we need to be aware of that. As a Council we've done as much as we can to retain that zoning but that zoning, it's not cast iron. People can go -- the Board have been known to go against County Plans and Local Area Plans. So we need to be aware of that and we need to keep an eye on
it.

I am satisfied, as Councillors in the area, that we did everything we could. We gave that commitment and we've retained that zoning but we will have to watch it. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Vance.
CLLR. VANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm disappointed as well that the sizable stake that the Government had in Ardmore has been sold. I don't think that's desirable because certainly that had a hold on certain development in the future in regard to that. I'm amazed that we have a Minister for Health and he seem to be involved in everything else except looking after people's livelihoods and jobs in the area and he's writing to everybody about St. Paul's now. Effectively this is something that involves hundreds of people's jobs and security of hundreds of people's jobs and hundreds and thousands and millions to the economy in wicklow and that he doesn't seem to be protecting this area. Certainly $I$ heard nothing from him in regard to this as well.

Anyway, when I hear of this and I hear of one hundred percent being owned by private individuals, I don't know what's going to happen to the studios in this regard. I just had to think aren't we lucky that now we have the Ashford Studios now. Not everyone was in agreement with the Ashford Studios. Effectively at the
time there was a difficulty that people had in regard to supporting that but it was effectively most people felt that at least it was keeping the jobs in the County and they weren't going to anywhere else. That's where I'm concerned about this, like what cllr. Behan is saying that there would be a direction that the jobs would be filtered out of the town and down to Limerick. In effect with the recent application for Ashford Studios now to increase various stages and various facilities that they have for film, I think that has been very desirable. But like what cllr. Matthews has said and C11r. Behan is aware of as we11, we, over the years, that have been on the Council have made everything available that we could to support the studios and it has been unanimous in the Council in regard to that. It has been unanimous in regard to the film studios on that land and certainly for as long as I'm going to be on the Council I would certainly be supporting the film studios and I will not be supporting de-zoning of that land for any other purpose 16:42 other than for film studios. Thank you, Chairman. CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks. Okay, Members, that completes Item 11.

CLLR. BEHAN: Are we going to invite them to come? CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, that was proposed by you and that 16:42 was agreed..
MS. GALLAGHER: Yeah.
CATHAOIRLEACH: You also had a proposal about writing to Enterprise Ireland.

CLLR. BEHAN: Two proposals. One is to write to the Minister for Enterprise asking for clarification on the detail of the deal and why they sold. And then secondly to invite the new owners to come to address the Council about their future plans.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will take the proposal. Item 13:
Notice of Motions.
CLLR. BEHAN: Is there any correspondence?
CATHAOIRLEACH: No, there's no correspondence.
CLLR. BEHAN: Some Councillors may have got an e-mail

16:43 from Kevin Sharkey asking and just to -- he has asked to come and address the Council to seek a nomination to run as a candidate in the presidential election. CLLR. MURPHY: That only came in there.
CLLR. BEHAN: I think we only got the e-mail earlier on 16:43 during the meeting. Is it possible that we put that item even as an item for the agenda?
MS. GALLAGHER: Well if you could send that. I didn't get that correspondence as the Meeting's Administrator because we have had another request as well. So I was kind of waiting until a presidential election was called for before inviting people -CLLR. BEHAN: It might never be called if there's not even a candidate.
MS. GALLAGHER: We've had other requests. I was going to bring it up at Protocol this evening if you don't mind.

CLLR. WHITMORE: Can I just come in on that. Just in relation to that e-mail and if it is on the agenda can

I ask people to have a look at the -- I think Kevin Sharkey was on the Ray D'Arcy Show and he was on TV3 and before we have any discussion about Kevin and his presidential campaign I would ask that people actually take a look at those interviews because I think it really shows the type of campaign he is going to be running. I found his language very divisive. I think it would be very informative for people to just have a look at that before we have a discussion about it.

CLLR. MCLOUGHLIN: He's a racist.
CLLR. WHITMORE: He is. His language was awful.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thanks, Members. Notice of Motion in the name of Cllr. Gail Dunne.

MS. GALLAGHER: Yes, Cathaoirleach, "that Wicklow County Council provide the Members with a detailed report on the coastal erosion that has occurred over the last number of months at The Murrough, Wicklow Town. Furthermore, provide the Members with details of the proposed plan of action and timeframe to further remediate and maintain the coastline of this area."

The response is "that Wicklow County Council have been in discussion with Irish Rail and the OPW about a study to examine, in detail, the pattern of erosion of the soft coastline north of Wicklow Town. We have agreed
with Irish Rail to pursue a study jointly to assess the erosion and consider solutions. The OPW have indicated that they will make a consideration to the study. The outline brief for consultants has been agreed between

Irish Rail and wicklow County Council at a meeting early in March between wicklow County Council and Irish Rail. It was agreed that an advertisement will be placed on eTenders by Irish Rail in order to appoint a consultant to carry out the study. It should be noted that the area in question is both an SAC and PMHA - an area designated at European level for conservation. I understand from Mark Devereux this morning that this call has been put out to tender by Irish Rail." CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Dunne.

CLLR. DUNNE: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks very much for the response. I'd like a copy of that response, please, Lorraine.
Ms. GALLAGHER: Sure.
CLLR. DUNNE: Obviously with the recent storm, the coastal erosion on The Murrough has gone from worse to worse. It's terrible. There's people talking about, we lost 10 to 12 feet in the last storm. It's something that in my opinion it has been put on the long finger and we had the minister down discussing this with us a long time ago. And the longer it goes on the more erosion occurs. This is a very special part of Wicklow Town, in fact it's a special part of the County. A lot of people used the area for walking, recreation, a lot of sports clubs use the area for There's a lot of ang1ing up there as we11. And it's something that, you know, we've had some coast protection there but we seem to be shovelling the
problem further and further out The Murrough. We need a solution to this problem. I'm calling on wicklow County Council to pursue this as vigorously as possible because the longer we leave this the worse it could go on,. a number of people around the town have discussed this. As I say, it's a historic part of the town and a lot of people just love the area in general. So while I'm delighted with the response hopefully this will move on quite quickly and again I would like a copy of the response. Thank you, Chairman.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Mitchel1.
CLLR. MITCHELL: I would like to welcome this study. I think it's badly needed. As I understand it the study is to go from wicklow Town to Bray Head though. I'm not quite sure on the geographic coverage but I think it is go to Bray Head. It certainly needs to go that far. There is significant erosion in a variety of places around this piece of coastline.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Kavanagh.
CLLR. KAVANAGH: Cathaoirleach, I'd like to second C11r. Dunne's proposal. I think if you're familiar with The Murrough you can see how much damage has been done, especially in the last few weeks since Storm Emma. It has absolutely taken massive chunks of the land that's left. It has washed it again. I think we probably lost about two metres which is a hell of a lot of land to lose considering what we have done in the last few years. There is one particular area that has gone so bad that it's exactly in the position of where

Iarnród Éireann went in to save the line about two years ago after Storm Frank. So I think it's at a crisis situation now and I think Wicklow County Council are going to have to go in there very, very quickly to do some remedial works if we don't start getting something done, try to get some funds somewhere to try and shore it up. But it's a disaster waiting to happen.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Sne11.
CLLR. SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. It always amazes me really when, you know, The Murrough is the jewel in the crown in East Wicklow and everyone concurs with that but yet I do be flabbergasted when I hear people calling on Wicklow County Council to do something to save The Murrough in regards the damage that is happening down there. We all know that putting a sticky plaster is it is not going to help and that happened there quite recently when miliions was put into the coastal erosion protection of The Murrough, only about 18 months ago. while it saved a section of The Murrough obviously it didn't save it all. It has been high1ight here in this Chamber on many, many occasions and I'm sure perhaps over the last 30 or 40 years it has been mentioned by previous public representatives. The reality is that we've had ministers come down and look at this, we've had sitting TDs come down for photo opportunities. We've had MEPs come down with the promise of European funding and the reality is that the budget isn't there within wicklow

County Council. To call on the management of Wicklow County Council to go down and put in works to save the The Murrough is ludicrous. This is a huge body of works that needs to be carried out and we need EU funding. We need central funding from the Government. And we need all this showboating that happens from time to time when people feel an election is around the corner where they come down and they parade themselves up and down The Murrough to protect The Murrough. It's an absolute joke and to be honest it's going to take something a little bit more than sound bites and photo opportunities.

So I would suggest that today, Cathaoirleach, the most realistic thing we could do as a Council is to write to $16: 51$ Boxer Moran, the Minister who was down here quite recently, and ask him for an update in regards to what he found when he came down here with his officials and what they all plan to do in regards to Central Government and did any of them ever approach, for EU funding?, because that's what it's going to take. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Murphy.
CLLR. MURPHY: Yeah, we're in a similar situation in Arklow. We've been left with a sad North Beach situation for the last number of years and, again, both our engineers have worked tirelessly, tirelessly over the last three or four years with putting in reports to the Department of Environment. Again, as

C11r. John Sne11 says, many an opportunity for photographs and TDs and whoever else is there on the day. Many reports have been handed in on request. We were promised money personally in a room in the Chamber
two years ago from, or three years ago, probably from the former Minister for Environment, Simon Harris. We never got it. The report says (inaudible) and with quite extreme of work and we're still being neglected and no Wicklow County Council will ever be able to put funds into it. It's a sad state of affairs. These are ${ }_{16: 52}$ our amenities. These are our only amenities and I mean what's going to happen? And I concur with what C11r. Sne11 says. It's a joke. It's an absolute joke. CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 2 Notice of Motion in the name of Cl1r. Joe Behan.

MS. GALLAGHER: Cathaoirleach, "That this Council makes a policy commitment to provide adequate public seating in every cemetery under its control and in particular that this Council provides public seating in St. Gabriel's Cemetery, Arklow which currently has no seating for people visiting the cemetery to pay their respects to their departed family members and friends."

The response is that "Each Municipal District is provided with a smal1 maintenance budget for graveyards on a yearly basis. Each MD could arrange for seating through this process if required. There would unlikely be adequate budget in 2018 to provide seating across 38 graveyards in the County. An alternative option for
provision may be that seating is sponsored and provided by local business, through agreement again with Local MD offices."

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Behan.
CLLR. BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, could I just say, I mean we've 38 cemeteries in the County, 38 pub7ic seats I don't think would break the bank of this Council. what I'm calling for is that we make a decision in principle that we should do this and obviously we have to try and follow up to ensure that there's funding. But what has 16:54 happened in this particular case and I'm sure the Arklow Councillors, I know they know it better than I do, is that older people who are in visiting the graves of departed loved ones have absolutely nowhere to sit down and just get a bit of peace of quiet for a few minutes. They're sitting on the grass or they're kind of walking around and they just don't have anywhere to sit. It's only one of, as I say, whatever it is, 38. could I just ask, please, that we just try and ensure that there is money to put a seat in every graveyard in 16:54 the County. Surely that's not too much to ask in a multimillion budget of this Council. I don't agree, by the way, of having businesses sponsoring seats in cemeteries. I just think that is tacky. I mean a cemetery is a place of solemnity. It's a place where people go to think about their loved ones. People are very, very emotional and upset and to be sitting on a seat sponsored by some local business, to my mind, isn't acceptable. It should be our responsibility to
do this, Cathaoirleach, I think.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Kavanagh.
CLLR. KAVANAGH: I just want to refer back to
C11r. Dunne's proposal that I seconded. Obviously the
County Council here does not have the funds to rescue
The Murrough. We all know that. But the fact is that they have the capacity to seek funding from the EU to allow whatever funds is at their disposal. So there was a proposal and I seconded it that we try to do something to save The Murrough. Has that been agreed? I'm just a bit unclear as to how it's been left. I occasionally meet officials from the County Council up The Murrough and we discuss the state of the place and the way to try and rescue it and I just don't know where we're at with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: we agreed the proposal made by
C11r. Dunne. There was a proposal made. That's what we agreed.
MS. GALLAGHER: You're seconding C11r. Dunne's motion. You're supporting it basically. And C11r. Sne11 has made another proposa1. So there's two there. The first proposal really is the report that you've been provided, that the Members have been provided with. So if you read the motion that's what you're supporting. CLLR. KAVANAGH: But then Cllr. Snell made a second proposal.

MS. GALLAGHER: which was seconded and agreed. CLLR. KAVANAGH: Okay, that's great. Thank you. CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 3 Notice of Motion in the name of

Cllr. Joe Behan.
MS. GALLAGHER: "That this Council receives a full report on the delays in the provision of updated broadband infrastructure in Knockmore, Arklow."
"Members are aware that the Knockmore Estate is in an area where broadband services are generally commercially available. It is therefore not covered by the National Broadband Plan. Open eir has advised in relation to Knockmore Estate broadband issue that the works required to upgrade the cabinet to fibre is unfortunately not in their current capital expenditure plans. Open eir have explained that the upgrade works required would involve relocation of an upgraded cabinet. It has been estimated that this would cost 20k extra on the normal upgrade costs thus a commercial business case for the upgrade was not viable. It was therefore left out of the current eir capital expenditure programme.

It can be noted that Virgin Media are currently building out their Network within Arklow and therefore there will be another fibre option within the town in the coming six months or so, this will provide commercial incentive for current operators to invest in their current services to Knockmore.

Also SIRO are also planning to build a network in Arklow. I am meeting them in the coming few weeks.

Other than that mobile providers of broadband should be looked into by residents that they provide high-speed internet access in the Knockanrahan area."
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Behan.
CLLR. BEHAN: Chairman, I'11 be very quick. This has arisen again because eir formerly eircom, formerly the Irish Government who gave away, sold off the infrastructure of this telecommunications of this country are in dispute with this Council about the movement of a cabinet near a roundabout because road works were done at the entrance to this estate. The lack of broadband in this estate is seriously harming, particularly people who are trying to run a business from their house, who are self-employed and who find that their broadband signal is dropping constantly. Could I appeal for some kind of meeting to take place between representatives of this Council and representatives of eir. $€ 20,000$ sounds like an awful lot of money to me to move a cabinet. I think there has been disagreement between the Council and eir over this. Is it possible, Cathaoirleach, for a meeting to take place between Council representatives and eir representatives to try and sort out this problem, if at all possible? Because no matter who comes in, I think the communications cabinet is going to have be constructed. If that is possible, Cathaoirleach, I would ask that we could arrange that to get somebody from the Council. Can we do that? CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah.

CLLR. BEHAN: Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Murphy.
CLLR. MURPHY: No, that's okay.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 4: Notice of Motion.
MS. GALLAGHER: In the names of cllr. McDonald,
C11r. Lawless and C11r. O'Connor "that Wicklow County Council notes that Irish Rail plan to change to a hybrid fleet and extend the DART Network northwards to Balbriggan or westwards to Maynooth. It further notes that there is no mention of any upgrade south of Bray.

This Council calls on Irish Rail to include the line south of Bray in its planned upgrade of the rail network which would facilitate the many daily commuters from Counties Wexford and wicklow."

There's no response to that.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Lawless.
CLLR. LAWLESS: I think just earlier on, you know, Cl1r. Mitchell we've kind of discussed this time and
time again and he put in a proposal as well. I
definitely think it's something we need to be pushing which Cllr. Mitchell was talking about earlier on. We need to be pushing our rail as best we can. It would have been good to get some kind of response back from them. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Item 5.
MS. GALLAGHER: In the name of the Cathaoirleach "that the Department of Social welfare do not close the

District Social Welfare Office in Baltinglass." CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Neill, would you like to speak on it?
CLLR. O'NEILL: Again I'd like to support
Cllr. Timmins' motion there that there's a threat to the Social welfare Office in Baltinglass. I'm not sure whether that has been solved. I would like that this Council would write to the Department as regards the Social welfare office in Blessington. That's been removed now for almost two years, which means that people needing any sort of Social Welfare assistance in West Wicklow, i.e. Ballyknocken, Ballymount, Hollywood around Kilbride, that they have to go to Tallaght for any of the services. It was very handy. It was there on a Thursday. It was only a half-day every Thursday of the week but it was very important. So I definitely wouldn't like to see the one in Baltinglass going. I would like to amend that so that we can call on the Department to reopen it for the sake of four hours a week to reopen the Social welfare Office, which was based in the Council buildings in Blessington. CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Ruttle.
CLLR. RUTTLE: Cathaoirleach, I would support your motion to keep the Baltinglass office open. The potential closure of these offices is really a retreat 17:02 from rural Ireland and we can't let it go on. The Baltinglass office was very well run (inaudible). I'm fully supportive of your motion to retain it. CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I ask that we write to the Minister
along those lines. Is that agreed?
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Members.
MS. GALLAGHER: Finally, just to mention that the Joint Policing Committee will hold their public meeting in Arklow up at the new library on Wednesday, 18th April, that's Wednesday week at 8:00 p.m. Just to remind Members that there is a civic reception to the Blessington Enterprise Towns Award at 5:30 and we will have Protocol here now.
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| certify [1]-1:19 <br> cetera [10] - | charged [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { 100:13, 106:2 } \\ \text { clarified [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | 105:5, 105:11, | 106:28, 107:10, | COMMENCED <br> [1] - 2:1 |
| 30:20, 30:29, | 97:28 | 4:8, 10:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:12, 107:13, } \\ & 108: 10.109: 11 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:11, 108:11, } \\ & \text { 108:15, 109:12, } \end{aligned}$ | comment [5] - |
| 38:7, 39:1, 39:15, | Charlesland | clarify [2] | 109:19, 109:21, | 109:20, 110:10, | 34:11, 42:28, |
| 57:7, 57:13, 89:7, $90 \cdot 28$ | $\begin{gathered} -73: 15,88: 1 \\ \text { Charleslan } \end{gathered}$ | 32:13, 91:21 | 110:9, 111:23, | 111:24, 113:5, | $43: 21,55: 8$ |
| Chair [2] - 4:15, | $\text { [1] }-88: 2$ |  | 112:1, 112:13, | 114:3, 114:25, | 84:17 |
| $95: 19$ | Charlie [1] - 2:23 |  | 112:15, 113:4, | 114:28, 116:5 | $-36: 13,36: 22$ |
| Chairman [20] - | charts [2]-27:7, |  | 114:2, 114:4, | 117:1, 117: |  |
| 2:8, 2:20, 4:29, | 28:7 | 56:3 | 114:17, 114:19, | 117:19, 118:4, 118.23 | 32:2, 85:5, 97:11, |
| 5:4, 6:29, 7:16, | cheap [1] - | clear [9]-9:18, | 114:20, 114:25, | close [2]-64:13, |  |



| 22:22, 25:2, 31:6, | 115:12, 115:18, | decade [2] - | Delivery [3] - | detail [7]-21:3, | Devereux [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45:7, 82:17 | 115:25, 115:26 | 13:27, 20:14 | 88:24, 97:21, | 25:21, 41:26, | 108:8 |
| Court [1]-33:13 | cut [1]-50:12 | December [2] - | 98:25 | 49:10, 78:5 | dezoned [1] - |
| courthouse [1] - | cute [1]-7:24 | 26:24, 66:24 | demand [3] - | 106:3, 107:2 | 82:2 |
| 69:18 | cycled [1]-22:8 | decent [1] - 75:8 | 26:11, 27:10, | detailed [11] - | died [2]-2:17, |
| $46: 23,47: 8,51: 1$ |  |  |  | $28: 13,29: 2,$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 46: 23,47: 8,51: 1 \\ \text { cousins [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 88:21 | decided [2] | $36: 5,82: 27$ | 29:12, 29:26, | $17: 14,45: 12$ |
| 34:24 |  | $\begin{gathered} 38: 4,76: 20 \\ \text { decides }[2] \end{gathered}$ | 103:20 <br> democratically | $\begin{array}{r} 97: 15,107: 15 \\ \text { detailing }[1]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { different }[14] \text { - } \\ 8: 15.23: 7.31: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| coverage [2] - | D | $\begin{array}{r} 87: 24,87: 25 \\ \text { decision }[4]- \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 15,23: 7,31: 20, \\ & 33: 14,46: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 14:13, 109:15 } \\ \text { covered [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | D'A | $\begin{array}{r} \text { decision }[4] \text { - } \\ 8: 2,50: 25,70 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} {[1]-36: 2} \\ \text { demoli } \end{array}$ | $37: 11$ <br> details [8] | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 16,60: 9,67: 1, \\ & 76: 2,79: 5,79: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| $98: 2,115: 8$ <br> covering [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:2 } \\ & \text { daily }[4]-20: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 113:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:17 } \\ & \text { demonstrabl } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:1, 23:5, 23:20, } \\ & 27: 5,28: 21,71: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 27,95: 20, \\ & 95: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:7 } \\ & \text { covers [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:23, 22:5, } \\ & 117: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:2, 36:5 } \\ & \text { declaration }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [1] }-62: 23 \\ & \text { demonstrates } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 101:27, 107:18 } \\ \text { determine }[4]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Differential [1] - } \\ & 49: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| 29:10, 58:14 | damage [2] - | 4:6 | [1] - 103:1 | 37:21, 37:23 | difficult [4] |
| 98:25 | 109:22, 110:15 <br> dangerous [1] - | declare | departed [2] - | 65:13, 79:21 | $29: 28,47: 7,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPT [1] - 4:21 } \\ & \text { crash [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | dangerous [1] - 39:9 | $4: 5,40: 4$ | $112: 22,113: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { determined [1] - } \\ & 38: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $56: 14,95: 7$ <br> difficulty |
| $20: 13,33: 25$ | dangle [1]-69:4 <br> darkness [1] - | $12: 23,12: 24$ | $-32: 4,32: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { develop [1] - } \\ & 4 \cdot 28 \end{aligned}$ | 105:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { create [1] - } \\ & 33: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 54:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 4, \\ & 27: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $61: 24,62: 5,$ | developed [1] | 103:23 |
| created [1] | DART ${ }_{\text {[4] }}$ | decrease [2] | 64:22, 64:23, | $33: 9$ | direction [11] - |
| 64:7 | 56:22, 69:17 | 12:20, 12:2 | 75:10, 81:4, 81:6, | developer [4] | 12:6, 22:3, 23:25, |
| Cresc | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 74: 13,117: 8 \\ \text { data } 81-29: 19 \end{array}$ | decreased [2] | 100:12, 103:16 | 33:27, 35:3 | $24: 8,28: 21$ |
| 10:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { data [8]-29:19, } \\ & \text { 29:29. 62:8. } \end{aligned}$ | 12:20, 14:17 | 111:29, 117:29 | 65:12, 65:15 | $31: 20,31: 22$, $32: 5,32: 6,76 \cdot 2$ |
| crisis [1] - 110:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 29,62: 8, \\ & 62: 10,63: 2 . \end{aligned}$ | defer [1] - 38:19 | $118: 8,118: 19$ | developing [2] - | $32: 5,32: 6,76: 2,$ |
| criteria [10] - | $64: 11,79: 17$ | defer/refuse [1] | department [2] - | $75: 6,85: 21$ | 105:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 60: 16,60: 25, \\ & 60: 29,61: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 98:27 | $\begin{array}{r} -51: 17 \\ \text { dofinc } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 51:11, } 58: 4 \\ \text { depressed } \end{gathered}$ | Development [31] - 32:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Direction [1] - } \\ & 31: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 61:17, 63:7, 67:1, | date [1] - 52:22 | define | 69:22 | $32: 21,32: 2$ | Directions [1] - |
| 74:4, 76:21, | DAY [2]-1:9 | $50: 24,59: 1$ | Derek [1] - 74:29 | 33:22, 34:19 | 82:20 |
| $96: 21$ | day-to-day $[3]$ | 60:4, 62:28 | Derek's [1] | 35:25, 36:5, 58:1, | directions [1] |
| critique [1] | day-to-day [3] - <br> $30 \cdot 18,31 \cdot 5,31 \cdot 8$ | 79:27, 87:6 | 74:25 | 58:2, 64:21, 66:9, | $36: 1$ |
| $58: 9$ | $\begin{gathered} 30: 18,31: 5,31: 8 \\ \text { de }[3]-77: 2, \end{gathered}$ | 87:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { derelict }[1] \\ & 25: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 20,66: 21, \\ & 66: 26,66: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { directly [1] } \\ & 31: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| 110:12 | 81:1, 105:20 | $95: 15,117: 2$ | deri | $67: 4,67: 7,67$ | di |
| CSO [8] - 12 | de-zoned [1] | 118:16 | $29: 2$ | 68:3, 68:6, 68:7, | $102: 27$ |
| 22:2, | 81:1 | definiti | Der | 69:8, 71:24, 72:6, | Director [2] |
| 22:29, 26:28 | de-zo | 60:6, 60:9, 63:20, | 78:14 | 76:10, 76:13 | 4:1, 90:17 |
| 59:11, 60:5, 60:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:2, 105:20 } \\ & \text { deal [6] }-90: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $66: 4,87: 16$ | Des [1] - 35:17 | $80: 16,81: 9 \text {, }$ | disabilities [4] - |
| cso.ie [1] - 26:29 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { deal }[6]-90: 20 \\ 92 \cdot 19 \text { 99:28 } \end{array}$ | delays [1] | describe | $\text { 81:11, } 86:$ | 15:26, 15:27, |
| Cullen [1] - 4:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:19, 99:28, } \\ & \text { 100:1, 100:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 115:3 | 15:2 | 92:18 | $29: 4,29: 11$ |
| CULLEN [4] - | 106:3 | delegates [1] - | design [1]-63:8 | [23] - 33:24, | Disability [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4: 29,5: 14,5: 18, \\ & 7: 1 \end{aligned}$ | dealing [5] | 78:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { designated [1] - } \\ & 108 \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[23]-33: 24,} \\ & 35: 14,58: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:29 } \\ & \text { disability }[15 \end{aligned}$ |
| CURRAN ${ }^{7} 16$ - | 25:5, 42:20, 47:6, | $\text { 31:12, } 109$ | designed ${ }^{11}$ | 61:9, 63:25, | $15: 19,15: 20$ |
| 4:21, 8:26, 9:2, | 47:27, 86:22 | deliver | $65: 10$ | 63:26, 63:27, | $15: 22,15: 24$ |
| 10:29, 11:18, | als [2] - 58:17 | 57:23 | des | 63:29, 65:12, | 15:28, 15:29, |
| 11:24, 31:19, | dealt [13] | delivered [4] - | 73:13 | 66:13, 68:15, | 22:28, 28:27, |
| 54:6, 55:4, 56:14, |  | 65:2, 92:23, 95:8, | desirable 2 [ | 82:16, $90 \cdot 10$ | 29:6, 29:9, 29:13, |
| 57:11, 88:25, |  | 95:10 | 104:10, 105:1 | 82:16, 90:10 | $29: 19,29: 2$ |
| $90: 17,91: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:11, 11:13, } \\ & 50: 3.51: 13 . \end{aligned}$ | delivering [2] - | desired [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 12,90: 21, \\ & 95: 14,98: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $30: 11,38: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:8, 96:26 } \\ & \text { current }[10] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 3,51: 13, \\ & 86: 14,97: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 65:11, 92:29 } \\ \text { delivers [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $7: 23$ <br> destruction [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:14, 98:7, } \\ & \text { 100:6, 101:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disagree }[3] \text { - } \\ & 35: 22,35: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 36:18, 37:27, | 98: |  |  | 104:12 | 36:26 |
| 40:21, 40:25, | death [1] - 2:16 | delivery [1] - | detached [1] - | development- | disagreement |
| 60:21, 80:5, | debts [1] - 99:27 |  |  | related [1] - 68:26 | [1] - 116:20 |


| disappoint [1] - | District [10] - | 50:12, 55:10, | during | 105:2 | 24, 33:28, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57:25 | 5:3, 5:10, 36:14, | 55:12, 61:19 | 31:27, 33:29 | fforts [1] - 48:2 | 59:10, 59:13, |
| disappointed [1] | 74:3, 75:13 | 61:26, 71:13 | 88:27, 106:16 | ght [4]-24:24 | 61:4, 61:21, 62:9, |
| - 104:8 | 94:16, 101:19 | 79:29, 81:26 | dusted [1] - 11:2 | 53:23, 72:11 | 68:25, 80:2 |
| disappointing | 112:24, 118:1 | $85: 4,89: 16$, $101 \cdot 3,101 \cdot 11$ | dwelling [1] - | $72: 22$ | employment- |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[2]-74: 18,102: 10} \\ & \text { disaster }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { district [2] - } \\ 74: 19,84: 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:3, 101:11, } \\ & \text { 102:13, 102:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $37: 24$ <br> dwellings [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { eir [7]-115:9, } \\ \text { 115:13, 115:18, } \end{gathered}$ | related [1] - 68:25 encouraged [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:7 } \\ & \text { discretion [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | istricts | 105:7, 108:20 |  | 116:6, 116:18, | - 98:15 |
|  | 4:23, 5:8, 70:3 | 110:16, 110:26 | dying [1] - 46:2 | 116:20, 116:22 | encouragemen |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:22 } \\ & \text { discretionary } \end{aligned}$ | districts [3] - | 111:2, 111:8, |  | eircom [1] - | $\mathbf{t}_{[1]}-63: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-50: 26} \\ & \text { discuss }[5]- \end{aligned}$ | 5:11, 74:1, 74:19 dividing [1] - | 111:9, 111:16, |  | $1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { encou } \\ -99: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 111:18, 113:15 |  | $15: 2,19: 6,36: 14$ | end [9]-12:2 |
| 8:16, 70:1, 99:3, 99:7, 114:13 | $4: 22$ <br> division [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Downes [1] - } \\ & \text { 11:27 } \end{aligned}$ | $3: 16,3: 17,3: 18$ | $72: 25$ | 18:6, 21:28, |
| discussed [8] - | $28: 7,79: 26$ <br> divisions [1] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 20,3: 21,5: 22, \\ & 5: 27,8: 2,8: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $38: 14,38: 29$ | 68:2, 76:17, |
| 4:18, 4:21, 7:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:29, 25:8, } \\ & 26: 21,28: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 27,8: 2,8: 4 \\ & 8: 5,8: 8,8: 9, \end{aligned}$ | elected [1] - | $79: 14,87: 29$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45: 14,58: 27 \\ & 103: 19,109: 5 \end{aligned}$ | ```87:19 divisive[1] - 107:7 document [20] -``` | 29:11, 29:20, | 8:10, 8:13, 8:26, | 36:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ended [1] - } \\ & 44: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 117:20 <br> discussing [2] - |  | $\begin{gathered} 30: 2,30: 9,31: 12 \\ \text { draft }[4]-37: 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 13,23: 21 \\ & 24: 6,52: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 18,42: 18 \\ & 98: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { energy [1] - } \\ & 55: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:19, 108:20 } \\ & \text { discussion [3] - } \\ & \text { 107:3, 107:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:11, 42:4, } \\ & \text { 42:10, 42:25, } \\ & 43: 1,43: 20 \\ & 43: 21,44: 1,44: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 58:28, 60:17 | $106: 15,106: 2$ | election [3] | enforcement [2] |
|  |  | 62:20 <br> Draft [2] - | early [6] - 20:13, | 106:13, 106:21, | $-56: 16,90: 5$ |
| 107:23 <br> discussions [1] |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:1 } \\ & \text { draw [2] }-65: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 25:12, 25:14, | 111:7 <br> electoral | $\begin{aligned} & \text { engage [2] - } \\ & 98: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:21, 44:1, 44:5, } \\ & 44: 15,44: 22, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:2, 76:1 } \\ & 108: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 28:7, 79:26, | engaged [3] |
| $-44: 23$ <br> disengage [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 25,45: 1,45: 4 \\ & 45: 9,58: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:10 } \\ & \text { drawing }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | earmarked [1] - | 87:19 <br> Electoral [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 15,80: 16, \\ & 86: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:26 } \\ & \text { disgraceful [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:23, 86:17 } \\ & \text { documents [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 76:27, } 87: 11 \\ \text { drawn [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 63: 28 \\ \text { east }[2]-35: 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:9 } \\ & \text { element }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { engaging [1] - } \\ & 38: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```36:11 disillusioned [1]``` |  | driver [2] | 71:9 <br> East [1] - 110:12 | 39:5 | Engineers [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { disillusioned [1] } \\ & -80: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $57: 29$ | $17: 25,17: 2$ | Eastern [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { elsewhere [1] - } \\ & 38: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 74:3 |
| displacement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:6, 56:10 } \\ & \text { dogs [1] - } 56: 4 \\ & \text { domestic [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { dropping [1] } \\ \text { 116:15 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:11, 59:17 } \\ & \text { easy [2] - 95:5, } \end{aligned}$ | embedded [1] - | $111: 27$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-39: 10} \\ & \text { display [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | Dublin [18] - | 95:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:1 } \\ & \text { emerged }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Enniskerry [3] - } \\ & \text { 94:17, 96:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31: 26 \\ & \text { disposal [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:11 } \\ & \text { done } 277]-6: 5 \text {, } \\ & 11: 2,35: 23,44: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:17, 16:29, } \\ & 21: 14,21: 15, \end{aligned}$ | echo [1] - 102:5 economic [4] - | $27: 25$ | 96:25 |
| 9:20, 9:29, 10:23, |  | 21:17, 21:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 23,63: 11, \\ & \text { a2:10 } 2.7 \end{aligned}$ | 49:12, 51:19 | 62:11, 72:22 |
| 10:24, 10:26, |  | 59:14, 59:24, | Economic [1] - | 51:21 | 82:29, 113:10 |
| 11:6, 11:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 16,47: 13 \\ & 48: 3,48: 26,52: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Emma [1] - | 113:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:17, 11:19, } \\ & 114: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 48:3, 48:26, 52:9, 61:10, 62:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 9,64: 14 \\ & 65: 29,71: 20 \end{aligned}$ | economical [1] - | 109:24 | Enterprise [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:8 } \\ & \text { disposals [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:10, 62:16, } \\ & \text { 64:16, 67:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 29,71: 20, \\ & 75: 28,86: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 80:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emotional [1] - } \\ & \text { 113:27 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 12,105: 29 \\ & 106: 2,119: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:11 dispute [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 7,73: 10 \\ & \text { 81:21, 81:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:15, 87:16 } \\ & \text { due [5] - 12:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { economy [2]- } \\ & 35: 5,104: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emphasise }[3] \text { - } \\ & 75: 14,81: 11 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entire }[1]-67: 10 \\ & \text { entirety }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:9 } \\ & \text { disrespect }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 20,89: 16, \\ & 93: 22,95: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:23, 98:22 } \\ & \text { Dun [5] - 89:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ED [2]-87:29, } \\ & 88: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 101:8 | $80: 4$ |
|  | 103:9, 103:25 |  | education [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emphasised }[1] \\ & -52: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { entities [2] - } \\ \text { 100:25, 101:9 } \end{gathered}$ |
| $6: 13$ <br> disres | 109:23, 109:27 | $91: 13,91: 18$ | effect [2] - | emphasising [2] | entitled [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & -7: 25 \\ & \quad \text { distance }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | Donegal [1] - | Dunne [6] - 2:6, | $66: 10,105: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & -75: 3,75: 10 \\ & \text { employed }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:3 } \\ & \text { entity [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17:8, 17:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:29 } \\ & \text { double [1] - 75:7 } \\ & \text { down [40] - 7:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 7,9: 23,107: 13 \\ & 108: 10,114: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 32:6 | 20:6, 20:9, | $84: 16,101: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:11, 73:12 } \\ & \text { distinction [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | DUNNE [4] - 2:8, | effective [2] 51:5, 80:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:14 } \\ & \text { employees [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entrance [1] - } \\ & \text { 116:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:7 } \\ & \text { distinguishing } \\ & {[1]-42: 14} \\ & \text { distributing }[1]- \\ & 9: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 23,22: 15,26: 2, \\ & 26: 29,28: 7, \\ & 28: 14,28: 28, \\ & 32: 9,35: 5,39: 20, \\ & 42: 2,46: 5,49: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 24,108: 11, \\ & \text { 108:15 } \end{aligned}$ | effectively [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:6 } \\ & \text { employment } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { environment }[1] \\ & -98: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 110:26, 113:16, $113: 27$ | 117:29, 118:1, | 47:2 | spirit [1] - 77:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 15,99: 28, \\ & 100 \cdot 3 \quad 100 \cdot 9 \end{aligned}$ | $78: 18,86: 5$ |
| 113:27 <br> situated [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:6, 118:9, } \\ & \text { 118:11, 118:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sound [1] - } \\ & 111: 11 \end{aligned}$ | spite [1] - 70:25 spoken [2]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:3, 100:9, } \\ & \text { 102:10, 102:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { strategically }[1] \\ & -100: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:1 | social [11] - | sounds [2] | 3:29, 49:13 | state [2] - | Strategy [4] - |
| situation [9] - | 19:27, 38:17 | 100:29, 116: | sponsored [2] - | 112:10, 114:13 | 54:13, 86:14 |
| 13:13, 27:10, | 47:18, 47:20 | sources [2] | 113:1, 113:28 | State's [1] - | 86:15 |
| 66:26, 76:19, | 47:29, 51:15 | 84:4, 84:24 | sponsoring [1] - | 100:15 | strategy [4] |
| 78:16, 82:4, | 52:27, 62:25 | South [2]-75:1, | 113:23 | stating [1] - 86:9 | 67:13, 76:26 |
| 110:3, 111:24, | 62:26, 63:11, | 75:29 | sports [1] | station [3] - | 87:14, 100:2 |
| 111:26 | 80:6 | south [4] | 108:25 | 71:19, 89:25, | stream [2] |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }}[10]-21: 6,$ | soft [1] - 107:25 | 71:12, 71:26 | square [1]-10:1 | 89:27 | 55:7, 94:5 |
| 43 | sold [9] - 99:24 | 117:10, 117:1 | St [8] - 3:9, 3:28, | Statistics [1] | streamline |
| $53: 21,53: 22$ | $100: 10,100$ | Southern [1] - 87.29 | 8:23, 10:24, | 11:27 | 37:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 65: 4,80: 29, \\ & 81: 20,89: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $103: 1,104: 10$ | Southwest [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:17, 78:17, } \\ & \text { 104:16, 112:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 23:6, 23:8, 26:19, | strikes [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:24 } \\ & \text { six-year [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 3,116: 7 \\ & \text { solemnity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75:29 } \\ & \text { southwest [9] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { staff }[14]-4: 3 \\ 25: 25,42: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:27 } \\ & \text { status }[9]-38: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43: 2,43: 14 \\ \text { strong }[4]- \end{gathered}$ |
| 65:4 | 113:25 | 63:3, 63:10, | 44:16, 44:20 | 38:12, 38:26, | 60:22, 62:9 |
| sixty [1]-15:3 | solution [2] $25: 3,109 \cdot 2$ | 63:13, 64:10 | 45:25, 47:12, | $38: 28,39: 5,$ | $83: 13,101: 17$ |
| sixty-two-and- | 25:3, 109:2 | 64:13, 79:7, | $48: 3,55: 24,90: 7$ | $\text { 40:28, } 41: 29,$ | stronger [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { a-half }[1]-15: 3 \\ \text { sizable }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | 107:27 | $80: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 25,95: 2 \\ & 95: 27,98: 20 \end{aligned}$ | statutory | $\begin{array}{r} 63: 17 \\ \text { stro } \end{array}$ |
| 104:9 | ve | PC [18] - 40:3 | stage [7]-11:3, | 10:29 | 34:6, 35:22, 37:2, |
| size [6]-27:1 | 118:7 | 40:5, 41:1, 41:10, | 32:21, 34:11, | stays [1] - 80: | 72:1 |
| 27:17, 34:28, | some | 41:12, 41:21, | 58:21, 58:28 | stenographi | structure [1] - |
| 35:12, 79:13, | 43:4, 43:5, 43:12, | 41:26, 42:3, | 91:24, 94:25 | [1]-1:21 | 93:25 |
| 80:2 | 43:13, 43:16, | 42:29, 44:19 | stages [1] | Stenography [1] | stuck [3] |
| sizes [1] - 27:23 | 43:17 | 47:12, 48:7, 48:8, | 105:9 | $-1: 19$ | 43:10, 56:24 |
| Siún [1] - 101:8 | sometimes [2] - | 49:13, 51:28, | stagnant [1] | STENOGRAPH | 57:15 |
| slide [9]-13:14, | $50: 29,51: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:24, 67:25, } \\ & 70.5 \end{aligned}$ | $77: 14$ | $\mathbf{Y}_{[1]}-1: 26$ | studio [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:22, 17:7, } \\ & 20: 26 . ~ 21: 5 . \end{aligned}$ | somewhat [1] - 77:9 | 70:2 speakers [2] | stake [4] - <br> 99.25, 100:10 | step [1] - 84:7 | 101:17, 102:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 26,21: 5 \\ & 23: 19,37: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 77:9 somewher | $\begin{gathered} \text { speakers [2] } \\ 24: 20,35: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 25,100: 10 \\ & 100: 15,104: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { steps }[1]-66: 7 \\ & \text { stick [2] }-69: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 102:12 <br> Studios [13] |
| 58:15, 61:1 | 24:24, 25:6, | speaking | standalone [2] - | $69: 3$ | 99:4, 99:8, 99:12, |
| slight [1] - 53:20 | 43:27, 77:20 | 34:23, 34:29 | 43:28, 101:9 | sticky ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ | 99:14, 100:5, |
| slightly [5] - | 82:6, 110:6 | 78: | Standing [14] - | 110:17 | 100:21, 101:11, |
| 13:10, 15:16, | soon [1] - 79:18 | special [4] | 3:3, 3:15, 3:19, | still ${ }_{\text {[10] }}-30: 1$ | 101:26, 101:28, |
| 20:28, 60:8, | Sorcha [10] - | 41:29, 46:7, | $4: 10,4: 13,5: 25$ | $30: 23,48: 1$ | 102:25, 104:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:21 } \\ & \text { slots }[2]-72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 5,73: 27, \\ & 74: 24,76: 2,76: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 108:22, 108:23 } \\ \text { specific [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 1,6: 4,6: 22, \\ & 6: 26,6: 28,7: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 49:29, 53:28, $61: 10.62: 15$ | $104: 29,105: 9$ studios [11] - |
| $72: 25$ | $77: 5,77: 10$ | $8: 1$ | $\text { 8:17, } 9$ | 89:21, 101:9, | 99:9, |
| small [10] | 77:27, 84:11 | 38:13, 46:12 | stands [1] - 44:6 | 112:8 | 99:17, 99:25 |
| 17:22, 23:5, 23:7 | 85:28 | 69:9 | starker [1] - | stock [11] | 100:15, 100:24, |
| 23:10, 26:9, | sorcha [2] | specifically [1] - | 30:18 | 13:14, 13:17, | 104:26, 105:15, |
| 28:14, 71:4, | 57:18, 79:1 | 43:24 | start [8]-2:5 | 13:19, 13:22, | 105:17, 105:19, |
| 88:11, 92:29 | Sorcha's | spectrum | 37:12, 67:10, | 14:3, 14:6, 14:9, | 105:21 |
| $112: 25$ | $72: 5$ | $12: 26,18: 7$ | $76: 16,80: 11$ | 30:22, 37:25, | Studios' [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { smaller [4] - } \\ 26: 9,40: 13,75: 5, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sorry [14] - 2:20, } \\ 3: 13,6: 11,20: 8 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $99: 26,100: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 18,90: 27, \\ & 110: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38: 15,40: 14 \\ \text { stopped [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | 54:9 study [10] - |
| 75:7 | 35:19, 35:20, | speed [1] - | started [3] - | 56:23, 71:28 | 73:11, 86:20, |
| SNELL [4] - | 37:12, 57:24, | 116:2 | 8:15, 26:21, | storm [2] | 86:23, 87:22, |
| 9:26, 41:9, 52:1, | 68:17, 73:8, | spend [1] | 80:17 | 108:15, 108:18 | 107:23, 107:26, |
| 110:10 | 91:29, 94:8, 96:1, | 45:21 | starting | Storm [2] - | 107:28, 108:5, |
| Snell [11] - 9:27, | 97:3 | spending [1] - | 76:11, 76:12 | 109:23, 110:2 | 109:12, 109:13 |
| 41:8, 42:27, 48:6, | sort [8]-29:1, | $58: 2$ | $76: 16,93: 7$ | story [1] - 30:22 | stuff [4]-7:27, |
| 51:29, 53:19, | 52:10, 76:28, | spent [2] - | starts [3]- | straightaway [2] | 46:13, 81:22, |
| 110:9, 112:1, | 79:5, 82:23, | 44:23, 75:15 | 20:12, 66:4, 89:1 | -68:21, 74:2 |  |





